Degree-degree distribution in a power law random intersection graph with clustering

Mindaugas Bloznelis

Vilnius University, Lithuania
mindaugas.bloznelis@mif.vu.lt

22 November 2014

arXiv:1411.6247v1 [math.PR] 23 Nov 2014

Abstract

The bivariate distribution of degrees of adjacent vertices (degree-degree distribution) is an important network characteristic defining the statistical dependencies between degrees of adjacent vertices. We show the asymptotic degree-degree distribution of a sparse inhomogeneous random intersection graph and discuss its relation to the clustering and power law properties of the graph.

key words: degree-degree distribution, power law, clustering coefficient, random intersection graph, affiliation network, assortativity coefficient, random walk

1 Introduction

Correlations between degrees of adjacent vertices influence many network properties including the component structure, epidemic spreading, network robustness, etc., see [8], [14], [19], [20] and references therein. The correlations are defined by the degree-degree distribution, i.e., the bivariate distribution of degrees of endpoints of a randomly chosen edge. In this paper we present an analytic study of the degree-degree distribution in a mathematically tractable random graph model of an affiliation network possessing power law degrees and non-vanishing clustering coefficient. Our study is motivated firstly by the interest in tracing the relation between the degree-degree distribution and clustering properties in a power law network. Secondly, the degree-degree distribution shows up in the analysis of the simple random walk on network, namely, it defines the transition matrix of the corresponding Markov chain, when sites are identified with vertex degrees (not the vertices themselves), see [2].

Next in this section we introduce the random graph model and present our results. Proofs are postponed to Section 2.

Affiliation network and random intersection graph. An affiliation network defines adjacency relations between actors by using an auxiliary set of attributes. Let V denote

the set of actors (nodes of the network) and W denote the auxiliary set of attributes. Every actor $v \in V$ is prescribed a collection $S_v \subset W$ of attributes and two actors $u, v \in V$ are declared adjacent in the network if they share some common attributes. For example one may interpret elements of W as weights and declare two actors adjacent whenever the total weight of shared attributes is above some threshold value. Here we consider the simplest case, where $u, v \in V$ are called adjacent whenever they share at least one common attribute, i.e., $S_u \cap S_v \neq \emptyset$. Two popular examples of real affiliation networks are the film actor network, where two actors are declared adjacent if they have played in the same movie, and the collaboration network, where two scientists are declared adjacent if they have coauthored a publication.

A plausible model of a large affiliation network is obtained by prescribing the collections of attributes to actors at random. Furthermore, in order to model the heterogeneity of human activity, every actor $v_j \in V$ is prescribed a random weight y_j reflecting its activity. Similarly, a random weight x_i is prescribed to each attribute $w_i \in W$ to model its attractivity. Now an attribute $w_i \in W$ is included in the collection S_{v_j} at random and with probability proportional to the attractivity x_i and activity y_j. In this way we obtain a random graph on the vertex set V, sometimes called the inhomogeneous random intersection graph ([3], [4], [5], [9], [21], see also [16]). This random graph possesses desired properties of a complex network (non-vanishing clustering coefficient, power law degree distribution and short distances). Before giving a detailed definition of this random graph model let us mention a recent publication [18], which argues convincingly that in some social networks the 'heavy-tailed degree distribution is causally determined by similarly skewed distribution of human activity'. The empirical evidence reported in [18] suggests that the inhomogeneous random intersection graph can be considered as a realistic model of a power law affiliation network.

Inhomogeneous random intersection graph. Let $X_1, \dots, X_m, Y_1, \dots, Y_n$ be independent non-negative random variables such that each X_i has the probability distribution P_1 and each Y_j has the probability distribution P_2. Given realized values $X = \{X_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and $Y = \{Y_j\}_{j=1}^n$ we define the random bipartite graph $H_{X,Y}$ with the bipartition $V \cup W$, where $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ and $W = \{w_1, \dots, w_m\}$. Every pair $\{w_i, v_j\}$ is linked in $H_{X,Y}$ with probability

$$p_{ij} = \min\{1, \lambda_{ij}\}, \qquad \text{where} \quad \lambda_{ij} = \frac{X_i Y_j}{\sqrt{nm}},$$

independently of the other pairs $\{i, j\} \in [m] \times [n]$. The *inhomogeneous* random intersection graph $G = G(P_1, P_2, n, m)$ defines the adjacency relation on the vertex set V: vertices $u, v \in V$ are declared adjacent (denoted $u \sim v$) whenever u and v have a common neighbor in $H_{X,Y}$. We call this neighbor a witness of the adjacency relation $u \sim v$.

The random graph G has several features that make it a convenient theoretical model of a complex network. Firstly, the statistical dependence of neighboring adjacency relations in G mimics that of real affiliation networks. In particular, G admits a tunable clustering coefficient: For $m/n \to \beta \in (0, +\infty)$ as $m, n \to +\infty$, we have, see [7],

$$\mathbf{P}(v_1 \sim v_2 | v_1 \sim v_3,\, v_2 \sim v_3) = \frac{\kappa}{\kappa + \sqrt{\beta}} + o(1). \tag{1}$$

Here $\kappa := b_1 b_2^{-1} a_3 a_2^{-2}$ and $a_i = \mathbf{E}X_1^i$, $b_j = \mathbf{E}Y_1^j$.

Another important feature of the model is its ability to produce a rich class of (asymptotic) degree distributions including the power law distributions. The following result of [4] will be used below and we present it here for convenience.

Theorem 1. *Let $m, n \to \infty$.*
(i) Assume that $m/n \to \beta$ for some $\beta \in (0, +\infty)$. Suppose that $\mathbf{E}X_1^2 < \infty$ and $\mathbf{E}Y_1 < \infty$. Then $d(v_1)$ converges in distribution to the random variable

$$d_* = \sum_{j=1}^{\Lambda_1} \tau_j, \tag{2}$$

where $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots$ are independent and identically distributed random variables independent of the random variable Λ_1. They are distributed as follows. For $r = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, we have

$$\mathbf{P}(\tau_1 = r) = \frac{r+1}{\mathbf{E}\Lambda_0}\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_0 = r+1) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbf{P}(\Lambda_i = r) = \mathbf{E}\, e^{-\lambda_i}\frac{\lambda_i^r}{r!}, \qquad i = 0, 1. \tag{3}$$

Here $\lambda_0 = X_1 b_1 \beta^{-1/2}$ and $\lambda_1 = Y_1 a_1 \beta^{1/2}$.
(ii) Assume that $m/n \to +\infty$. Suppose that $\mathbf{E}X_1^2 < \infty$ and $\mathbf{E}Y_1 < \infty$. Then $d(v_1)$ converges in distribution to a random variable Λ_3 having the probability distribution

$$\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_3 = r) = \mathbf{E}e^{-\lambda_3}\frac{\lambda_3^r}{r!}, \qquad r = 0, 1, \dots. \tag{4}$$

Here $\lambda_3 = Y_1 a_2 b_1$.
(iii) Assume that $m/n \to 0$. Suppose that that $\mathbf{E}X_1 < \infty$. Then $\mathbf{P}(d(v_1) = 0) = 1 - o(1)$.

We say that an integer valued non-negative random variable Z has a power law distribution with exponent $\varkappa > 1$ if for some $c > 0$ we have $\mathbf{P}(Z = r) \approx cr^{-\varkappa}$ as $r \to +\infty$. Here and below for real sequences $\{t_r\}_{r\geq 1}$ and $\{s_r\}_{r\geq 1}$ we denote $t_r \approx s_r$ whenever $t_r/s_r \to 1$ as $r \to +\infty$. More generally, we say that the distribution of a non-negative random variable Z has property $\mathcal{A}_{c,\varkappa}$ if either Z is integer valued and satisfies $\mathbf{P}(Z = r) \approx cr^{-\varkappa}$, or Z is absolute continuous with density f_Z satisfying $f_Z(t) = (c + o(1))t^{-\varkappa}$ as $t \to +\infty$.

In Lemma 3, see Appendix B, we show that if Y_1 has a power law distribution with exponent $\varkappa > 2$, then Λ_3 has a power law distribution with the same exponent $\varkappa$. In particular, $\mathbf{P}(Y_1 = r) \approx cr^{-\varkappa}$ implies $\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_3 = r) \approx c(a_2 b_1)^{\varkappa-1} r^{-\varkappa}$. The question about the power law property of d_* is a bit more subtle. Despite the fact that the tail behavior of randomly stopped sums, like d_*, is quite well understood (roughly speaking, the tail $\mathbf{P}(d_* > t)$ of d_* is as heavy as the heavier one of Y_1 and τ_1, see, e.g., [1]) not much is known about the asymptotics of the local probabilities of randomly stopped sums in the case where the distribution of the number of summands is heavy tailed. One may expect that, generally, under appropriate regularity conditions, the asymptotics of the local probabilities of randomly stopped sums follows a similar pattern to that of the tail probabilities. This is indeed the case when the summands are heavy tailed and the number of summands has a light tail, see, e.g., Theorem 4.30 in [11]. Several examples are considered in Remark 1.

Remark 1. *Let $c, x > 0$, $\varkappa > 2$.*
(i) Assume that $\mathbf{E}e^{aY_1} < \infty$ for some $a > 0$. Assume that the distribution of X_1 has property $\mathcal{A}_{c,\varkappa}$. Then $\mathbf{P}(d_* = r) \approx cb_1^{\varkappa-1}\beta^{(3-\varkappa)/2}r^{1-\varkappa}$.
(ii) Assume that $\mathbf{P}(X_1 = x) = 1$. Assume that the distribution of Y_1 has property $\mathcal{A}_{c,\varkappa}$. Then $\mathbf{P}(d_* = r) \approx c(x^2b_1)^{\varkappa-1}r^{-\varkappa}$.

Degree-degree distribution. We are interested in the bivariate distribution of degrees of adjacent vertices. Let

$$p(k_1, k_2) = \mathbf{P}(d(v_1) = k_1 + 1, d(v_2) = k_2 + 1 \,|\, v_1 \sim v_2), \qquad k_1, k_2 = 0, 1, \dots \tag{5}$$

denote the probabilities defining the conditional bivariate distribution of the *ordered* pair $(d(v_1), d(v_2))$, given the event that vertices v_1 and v_2 are adjacent. We note that $p(k_1, k_2) = p(k_2, k_1)$, for any $k_1, k_2 = 0, 1, \dots$, since the probability distribution of graph G is invariant under permutations of its vertices. In Theorem 2 below we show a first order asymptotics of $p(k_1, k_2)$ as $n, m \to +\infty$. Before formulation of Theorem 2 we introduce some notation. We remark that d_* defined by (2) depends on Y_1. By conditioning on the event $\{Y_1 = y\}$ we obtain another random variable, denoted d_y^*, which has the compound Poisson distribution

$$\mathbf{P}(d_y^* = r) = \mathbf{P}(d_* = r | Y_1 = y) = \mathbf{P}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{N} \tau_j = r\Big), \qquad r = 0, 1, \dots .$$

Here $N = N_y$ denotes a Poisson random variable which is independent of the iid sequence $\{\tau_j\}_{j\geq 1}$ and has mean $\mathbf{E}N_y = ya_1\beta^{1/2}$, $y \geq 0$. Given integers $k_1, k_2, r \geq 0$, denote

$$\begin{aligned}
q_r &= \mathbf{E}\big(Y_1\mathbf{P}(d_{Y_1}^* = r)\big) = \mathbf{E}\big(Y_1\mathbf{P}(d_* = r|Y_1)\big),\\
p_\beta(k_1, k_2) &= \frac{\beta}{b_1^4 a_2} \sum_{r=0}^{k_1\wedge k_2} (r+1)(r+2)\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_0 = r+2)q_{k_1-r}q_{k_2-r},\\
\tilde{p}(r) &= r\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_3 = r)\big(\mathbf{E}\Lambda_3\big)^{-1}, \qquad p_\infty(k_1, k_2) = \tilde{p}(k_1+1)\tilde{p}(k_2+1).
\end{aligned}$$

Our main result is the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *Let $m, n \to \infty$. Suppose that $\mathbf{E}X_1^2 < \infty$ and $\mathbf{E}Y_1 < \infty$.*
(i) Assume that $m/n \to \beta$ for some $\beta \in (0, +\infty)$. Then for every $k_1, k_2 \geq 0$ we have

$$p(k_1, k_2) = p_\beta(k_1, k_2) + o(1), \tag{6}$$

(ii) Assume that $m/n \to +\infty$. Then for every $k_1, k_2 \geq 0$ we have

$$p(k_1, k_2) = p_\infty(k_1, k_2) + o(1). \tag{7}$$

We note that the moment conditions $\mathbf{E}X_1^2 < \infty$ and $\mathbf{E}Y_1 < \infty$ of Theorem 2 are the minimal ones as each of the numbers $a_2 = \mathbf{E}X_1^2$ and $b_1 = \mathbf{E}Y_1$ enters both formulas (6) and (7).

Remark 2. *In the case where $m/n \to +\infty$, the size biased probability distribution $\{\tilde{p}(r)\}_{r\geq 1}$ is the limiting distribution of $d(v_1)$ conditioned on the event $v_1 \sim v_2$, i.e.,*

$$\mathbf{P}(d(v_1) = r | v_1 \sim v_2) = \tilde{p}(r) + o(1), \qquad r = 1, 2, \dots . \tag{8}$$

Remark 3. *Theorem 2 and Remark 2 remain valid if we replace (v_1, v_2) by any other ordered pair of vertices (v_i, v_j), or by an ordered pair of distinct vertices (u^*, v^*) chosen uniformly at random, since the probability distribution of graph G is invariant under permutation of its vertices.*

Let us examine how the clustering property (presence of nonvanishing clustering coefficient) affects the structure of the asymptotic degree-degree distribution. Firstly we consider the case $m/n \to +\infty$, where the clustering coefficient vanishes (cf. (1)). In this case one may expect that the statistical dependence between neighboring adjacency relations fade as $m, n \to +\infty$ and that degrees of adjacent vertices are asymptotically independent. This is indeed the case as (7) and (8) imply that

$$p(k_1, k_2) = \mathbf{P}(d(v_1) = k_1 + 1, \,|\, v_1 \sim v_2)\mathbf{P}(d(v_2) = k_2 + 1 \,|\, v_1 \sim v_2) + o(1).$$

For $m/n \to \beta \in (0, +\infty)$ the random graph G admits a nonvanishing clustering coefficient. Now, the neighboring adjacency relations remain statistically dependent and the asymptotic bivariate degree-degree distribution (6) is no more a product of marginal asymptotic degree distributions. One can show that in this case the degrees of adjacent vertices are positively correlated (because heavy weight attributes are likely to be shared by high degree vertices) and G admits a non-vanishing and positive Newman's assortativity coefficient, provided that the vertex degree distribution has a finite third moment (cf. [6]).
Several examples of power law degree-degree distributions are considered in Corollary 1 below.

Corollary 1. *Let $c, x > 0$ and $\varkappa > 2$.*
(i) Assume that $\mathbf{E}X_1^2 < \infty$. Assume that the distribution of Y_1 has property $\mathcal{A}_{c,\varkappa}$. Then for $k_1, k_2 \to +\infty$ we have

$$p_\infty(k_1, k_2) = (1 + o(1))c^2 a_2^{2\varkappa-4} b_1^{2\varkappa-6} (k_1 k_2)^{1-\varkappa}. \tag{9}$$

(ii) Assume that $\mathbf{E}e^{aY_1} < \infty$ for some $a > 0$. Assume that the distribution of X_1 has property $\mathcal{A}_{c,\varkappa}$. Let $k_1, k_2 \to +\infty$ so that $k_1 \le k_2$. Suppose that either $k_2 - k_1 \to +\infty$ or $k_2 - k_1 = k$, for an arbitrary, but fixed integer $k \ge 0$. Then

$$p_\beta(k_1, k_2) = (1 + o(1))\frac{\beta}{b_1^4 a_2} \times \begin{cases} c_1^* c_2^* k_1^{2-\varkappa}(k_2 - k_1)^{1-\varkappa} & \text{if} \quad k_2 - k_1 \to +\infty, \\ c_1^* c_{3,k}^* k_1^{2-\varkappa} & \text{if} \quad k_2 - k_1 = k. \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

Here $c_1^* = c(b_1\beta^{-1/2})^{\varkappa-1}$, $c_2^* = c b_1^{\varkappa-2} b_2 \beta^{(3-\varkappa)/2}$, and $c_{3,k}^* = \sum_{i\ge 0} q_i q_{k+i}$. Furthermore, we have $q_r \approx c_2^* r^{1-\varkappa}$.
(iii) Assume that $\mathbf{P}(X_1 = x) = 1$. Assume that the distribution of Y_1 has property $\mathcal{A}_{c,\varkappa}$. For $k_1, k_2 \to +\infty$ we have

$$p_\beta(k_1, k_2) = (1 + o(1))c^2 x^{4\varkappa-8} b_1^{2\varkappa-6} (k_1 k_2)^{1-\varkappa}. \tag{11}$$

It seems a bit surprising that the limiting degree-degree distribution $p_\beta(k_1, k_2)$ of example (iii) of the corollary, which refers to the clustering regime $m/n \to \beta \in (0, +\infty)$, has asymptotically independent marginals for $k_1, k_2 \to +\infty$.

Our final remark is about the case where $m/n \to 0$. By Theorem 1, in this case the edges of a sparse inhomogeneous random intersection graph span a subgraph on $o(n)$ randomly selected vertices leaving the remaining $(1-o(1))n$ vertices isolated. Consequently, the subgraph is relatively dense and we do not expect stochastically bounded degrees of endpoints of adjacent vertices.

Related work. The influence of degree-degree correlations on the network properties have been studied by many authors, see, e.g., [8], [14], [19], [20] and references therein. The asymptotic degree-degree distribution in a preferential attachment random graph with tunable power law degree distribution was shown in [13]. Our model and approach are much different. To our best knowledge the present paper is the first attempt to trace the relation between the degree-degree distribution and the *clustering property* in a power law network. Connections between Newman's assortativity coefficient and the clustering coefficient in a related random graph model has been discussed in [6].

2 Proof

Here we prove Theorem 2, Corollary 1 and Remarks 1, 2.

Before the proof we collect some notation. We will assume throughout the proof that $m = m(n) \to +\infty$ as $n \to +\infty$. The expressions $o(\cdot)$, $O(\cdot)$ will always refer to the case where $n \to +\infty$. We use the notation $o_P(\cdot)$ and $O_P(\cdot)$ consistently with [15]. Given two real sequences $\{a_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ and $\{b_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ we write $a_n \approx b_n$ to denote the fact that $(a_n - b_n)mn = o(1)$. By $\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{A}}$ we denote the indicator function of an event $\mathcal{A}$. $\bar{\mathbb{I}}_{\mathcal{A}} = 1 - \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathbb{I}_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}}$ denotes the indicator of the complement event $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$.

In the proof we often use the following facts: For a random variable Z and a sequence of events $\{\mathcal{K}_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ defined on the same probability space we have that $\mathbf{E}|Z| < \infty$ and $\lim_n \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{K}_n) = 0$ imply $\mathbf{E}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{K}_n} Z) = o(1)$; for a sequence of random variables $\{Z_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ the conditions $\exists C > 0$ such that $|Z_n| \leq C$ almost surely $\forall n$, and $Z_n = o_P(1)$ imply $\mathbf{E}|Z_n| = o(1)$.

We denote by $\mathbf{P}^\star$ and $\mathbf{E}^\star$ (respectively $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}$) the conditional probability and expectation given X_1, Y_1, Y_2 (respectively X, Y). For random variables ξ, ζ defined on the same probability space as X, Y we denote by $d^\star_{TV}(\xi, \zeta)$ (respectively $\tilde{d}_{TV}(\xi, \zeta)$) the total variation distance between the conditional distributions of ξ and ζ given X_1, Y_1, Y_2 (respectively X, Y). Given a sequence of random variables $\{Z_n\}_{n\geq 1}$, defined on the same probability space as Y_1, Y_2, X_1, the notation $Z_n = o_{P^\star}(1)$ means that, for any realized values Y_1, Y_2, X_1 and any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have $\mathbf{P}^\star(Z_n > \varepsilon) = o(1)$. We note that for $\{Z_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ independent of Y_1, Y_2, X_1 we have $Z_n = o_{P^\star}(1) \Leftrightarrow Z_n = o_P(1)$.

The degree of a vertex $v_i \in V$ is denoted $d_i = d(v_i)$. The number of common neighbors of $v_i, v_j \in V$ is denoted d_{ij}. For a vertex $v \in V$ and attribute $w \in W$ we denote by $\{w \to v\}$ the event that v and w are linked in H. Introduce the events $\mathcal{A}_i = \{w_i \to v_1, w_i \to v_2\}$, $1 \leq i \leq m$. We write for short

$$\mathbb{I}_{ij} = \mathbb{I}_{\{w_i \to v_j\}}, \qquad \bar{\mathbb{I}}_{ij} = 1 - \mathbb{I}_{ij}, \qquad \mathbf{I}_{ij} = \mathbb{I}_{\{\lambda_{ij} \leq 1\}}, \qquad \bar{\mathbf{I}}_{ij} = 1 - \mathbf{I}_{ij}.$$

Let $\mathbf{L} = (L_0, L_1, L_2)$ denote the random vector with marginal random variables

$$L_0 = u_1, \qquad L_1 = \sum_{2\le i\le m} \mathbb{I}_{i1} u_i, \qquad L_2 = \sum_{2\le i\le m} \mathbb{I}_{i2} u_i, \qquad u_i = \sum_{3\le j\le n} \mathbb{I}_{ij}, \quad 1 \le i \le m.$$

Let $\Lambda_0, \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \Lambda_3, \Lambda_4$ denote random variables having mixed Poisson distributions

$$\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_i = r) = \mathbf{E}(e^{-\lambda_i}\lambda_i^r/r!), \qquad r = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, \quad i = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4. \tag{12}$$

Here

$$\lambda_0 = X_1 b_1 \beta^{-1/2}, \quad \lambda_1 = Y_1 a_1 \beta^{1/2}, \quad \lambda_2 = Y_2 a_1 \beta^{1/2}, \quad \lambda_3 = Y_1 a_2 b_1, \quad \lambda_4 = Y_2 a_2 b_1.$$

We assume that conditionally, given Y_1, Y_2, X_1, the random variables Λ_i, $0 \le i \le 4$ are independent. Define random variables $d^*_{Y_1} = \sum_{i=1}^{\Lambda_1} \tau_i$ and $d^*_{Y_2} = \sum_{i=1}^{\Lambda_2} \tau'_i$. Here $\tau_i, \tau'_i, i \ge 1$ are independent and identically distributed random variables, which are independent of Y_1, Y_2, X_1 and have distribution (3). Define the events

$$\mathcal{U}_{k_1,k_2} = \{d_1 = k_1 + 1, d_2 = k_2 + 1\}, \qquad \mathcal{U}^*_{r,r_1,r_2} = \{\mathbf{L} = (r, r_1, r_2)\},$$
$$\mathcal{U}^{**}_{r,r_1,r_2} = \{\Lambda_0 = r, d^*_{Y_1} = r_1, d^*_{Y_2} = r_2\}, \qquad \mathcal{U}^{***}_{r_1,r_2} = \{\Lambda_3 = r_1, \Lambda_4 = r_2\}.$$

Define random variables $\hat{a}_j = m^{-1} \sum_{2\le i\le m} X_i^j$ and $\hat{b}_j = n^{-1} \sum_{3\le i\le n} Y_i^j$.

Proof of Theorem 2. Proof of (i). The intuition behind formula (6) is that the adjacency relation $v_1 \sim v_2$ together with the common neighbors of v_1 and v_2 are witnessed, with a high probability, by a single attribute (all attributes having equal chances). Furthermore, conditionally on the event that this attribute is w_1, and given Y_1, Y_2, X_1, we have that the random variables d_{12}, $d_1 - 1 - d_{12} =: d'_1$, $d_2 - 1 - d_{12} =: d'_2$ are asymptotically independent. We note that d'_1 and d'_2 count individual (not shared) neighbors of v_1 and v_2. The asymptotic independence comes from the fact that (conditionally given Y_1, Y_2, X_1) these random variables are mainly related via average characteristics $\hat{a}_1$, $\hat{b}_1$ which are asymptotically constant, by the law of large numbers. Now, using Theorem 1 we identify limiting distributions of d'_1, d'_2. The limiting distribution of d_{12} (conditioned on the event $\mathcal{A}_1$) is that of Λ_0.
We briefly outline the proof. In the first step we show that

$$p(k_1, k_2) = \frac{\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{U}_{k_1,k_2} \cap \{v_1 \sim v_2\})}{\mathbf{P}(v_1 \sim v_2)} = \frac{\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{U}_{k_1,k_2} \cap (\cup_i \mathcal{A}_i))}{\mathbf{P}(\cup_i \mathcal{A}_i))} = \frac{nm}{a_2 b_1^2} \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{U}_{k_1,k_2} \cap \mathcal{A}_1) + o(1). \tag{13}$$

Then using the total probability formula we split

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{U}_{k_1,k_2} \cap \mathcal{A}_1) = \sum_{r=0}^{k_1 \wedge k_2} \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{U}_{k_1,k_2} \cap \{d_{12} = r\} \cap \mathcal{A}_1). \tag{14}$$

In the second step we show that for every $r = 0, 1, \ldots, k_1 \wedge k_1$

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{U}_{k_1,k_2} \cap \{d_{12} = r\} \cap \mathcal{A}_1) \approx \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{U}^*_{r,k_1-r,k_2-r} \cap \mathcal{A}_1). \tag{15}$$

In the final step we show that for $r, r_1, r_2 = 0, 1, 2 \ldots$

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{U}^*_{r,r_1,r_2} \cap \mathcal{A}_1) \approx \mathbf{E}\big(\lambda_{11}\lambda_{12}\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{U}^{**}_{r,r_1,r_2})\big). \tag{16}$$

Now the simple identity

$$nm\mathbf{E}\big(\lambda_{11}\lambda_{12}\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{U}^{**}_{r,r_1,r_2})\big) = \frac{\beta}{b_1^2}(r+1)(r+2)\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_0 = r+2)q_{r_1}q_{r_2}$$

completes the proof of (6). Finally, we remark that in order to prove the result under the minimal moment conditions $\mathbf{E}Y_1 < \infty$ and $\mathbf{E}X_1^2 < \infty$, we invoke, when necessary, a truncation argument, which makes our presentation some more involved.
Step 1. Here we prove (13). To this aim we show that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{U}_{k_1,k_2} \cap \{v_1 \sim v_2\}) = m\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{U}_{k_1,k_2} \cap \mathcal{A}_1) + o(n^{-1}), \\ &\mathbf{P}(\{v_1 \sim v_2\}) = n^{-1}a_2b_1^2 + o(n^{-1}). \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Since $\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{A}_i) \le \mathbf{E}\lambda_{i1}\lambda_{i2} = a_2b_1^2(nm)^{-1}$, relations (17) imply (13). We only prove the second relation. The proof of the first one is much the same. Fix small $0 < \delta < 1$ and introduce events $\mathcal{H}_i = \{Y_i < \delta\sqrt{n}\}$, $i = 1, 2$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(\{v_1 \sim v_2\}) &= \mathbf{P}(\{v_1 \sim v_2\} \cap \mathcal{H}_1 \cap \mathcal{H}_2) + \mathbf{P}(\{v_1 \sim v_2\} \cap \bar{\mathcal{H}}_1 \cap \mathcal{H}_2) \\ &+ \mathbf{P}(\{v_1 \sim v_2\} \cap \mathcal{H}_1 \cap \bar{\mathcal{H}}_2) + \mathbf{P}(\{v_1 \sim v_2\} \cap \bar{\mathcal{H}}_1 \cap \bar{\mathcal{H}}_2) \\ &=: p_1' + p_2' + p_3' + p_4'. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Now we evaluate p_1' and construct upper bounds for p_i', $i = 2, 3, 4$. Using the independence of Y_1, Y_2 and Markov's inequality we obtain

$$p_4' \le \mathbf{P}(\bar{\mathcal{H}}_1 \cap \bar{\mathcal{H}}_2) \le \delta^{-2}n^{-1}(\mathbf{E}(Y_1\bar{\mathbb{I}}_{H_1}))^2. \tag{19}$$

Next, using the identity $\{v_1 \sim v_2\} = \cup_{1\le i\le m}\mathcal{A}_i$ and inequality

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{A}_1 \cap \bar{\mathcal{H}}_1) = \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{A}_1)\mathbb{I}_{\bar{\mathcal{H}}_1}) \le \mathbf{E}(\lambda_{11}\lambda_{21}\bar{\mathcal{H}}_1)$$

we obtain

$$p_2' \le \sum_{1\le i\le m}\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{A}_i \cap \bar{\mathcal{H}}_1) = m\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{A}_1 \cap \bar{\mathcal{H}}_1) \le \frac{a_2b_1}{n}\mathbf{E}Y_1\bar{\mathbb{I}}_{\mathcal{H}_1}. \tag{20}$$

Clearly, (20) extends to p_3'. An upper bound on p_1' is obtained in a similar way,

$$p_1' \le \mathbf{P}(\{v_1 \sim v_2\}) \le \sum_{1\le i\le m}\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{A}_i) \le \sum_{1\le i\le m}\mathbf{E}\lambda_{1i}\lambda_{2i} = n^{-1}a_2b_1^2. \tag{21}$$

To get a lower bound we invoke inclusion-exclusion. We have

$$p_1' \ge \sum_{1\le i\le m}\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{A}_i \cap \mathcal{H}_1 \cap \mathcal{H}_2) - \sum_{1\le i<j\le m}\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{A}_i \cap \mathcal{A}_j \cap \mathcal{H}_1 \cap \mathcal{H}_2) =: mp' - \tbinom{m}{2}p'', \tag{22}$$

where $p' = \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{A}_1 \cap \mathcal{H}_1 \cap \mathcal{H}_2)$ and $p'' = \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{A}_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_2 \cap \mathcal{H}_1 \cap \mathcal{H}_2)$. In order to evaluate $p' = \mathbf{E}\big(\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{A}_1)\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{H}_1\cap\mathcal{H}_2}\big)$ we invoke the inequalities

$$(1 - \bar{\mathbf{I}}_{11} - \bar{\mathbf{I}}_{12})\lambda_{11}\lambda_{12} \le \mathbf{I}_{11}\mathbf{I}_{12}\lambda_{11}\lambda_{12} = \mathbf{I}_{11}\mathbf{I}_{12}\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{A}_1) \le \mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{A}_1) \le \lambda_{11}\lambda_{12}. \tag{23}$$

We obtain

$$p' \ge \mathbf{E}\big(\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{A}_1)\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{H}_1\cap\mathcal{H}_2}\mathbf{I}_{11}\mathbf{I}_{12}\big) \ge (nm)^{-1}(a_2b_1^2 - R), \tag{24}$$

where $R = \mathbf{E}\big(Y_1Y_2X_1^2(\bar{\mathbf{I}}_{11} + \bar{\mathbf{I}}_{12} + \bar{\mathbb{I}}_{\mathcal{H}_1\cap\mathcal{H}_2})\big)$. The next upper bound for p'' is simple

$$p'' = \mathbf{E}\big(\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{A}_1)\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{A}_2)\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{H}_1\cap\mathcal{H}_2}\big) \le \mathbf{E}(\lambda_{11}\lambda_{12}\lambda_{21}\lambda_{22}\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{H}_1\cap\mathcal{H}_2}) \le \delta^2 n^{-1}m^{-2}\mathbf{E}(Y_1Y_2X_1^2X_2^2). \tag{25}$$

Collecting (24), (25) in (22) we obtain a lower bound for p_1'. Combining this lower bound with (21) we obtain

$$n^{-1}(a_2b_1^2 - R - \delta^2 a_2^2 b_1^2) \le p_1' \le n^{-1}a_2b_1^2. \tag{26}$$

Finally, we choose $\delta = \delta_n$ converging to 0 slowly enough so that $\delta\sqrt{n} \to +\infty$ and $\delta^{-1}\mathbf{E}(Y_1\bar{\mathbb{I}}_{H_1}) \to 0$. We obtain from (19), (20) that $p_2', p_3', p_4' = o(n^{-1})$ and (26) implies that $p_1' = n^{-1}a_2b_1^2 + o(n^{-1})$. Hence (17) follows from (18).

Step 2. Here we prove (15). Let us note that event $\mathcal{A}_1$ implies that L_0 counts common neighbors of v_1 and v_2 witnessed by w_1. In the case where $L_0 \ne d_{12}$ there should be a common neighbor of v_1, v_2 witnessed by some attribute w_i other than w_1 or witnessed by two different attributes, say $w_{i_1}, w_{i_2} \in W \setminus \{w_1\}$. We introduce related events

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{B}_{00} &= \{\mathbb{I}_{i1}\mathbb{I}_{i2} = 1 \text{ for some } 2 \le i \le m\},\\
\mathcal{B}_{01} &= \{\mathbb{I}_{i_11}\mathbb{I}_{i_1j}\mathbb{I}_{i_22}\mathbb{I}_{i_2j} = 1 \text{ for some } 3 \le j \le n \text{ and } 2 \le i_1 \ne i_2 \le m\}
\end{aligned}$$

and observe that on the event $\mathcal{A}_1 \cap \overline{(\mathcal{B}_{00} \cup \mathcal{B}_{01})}$ we have $L_0 = d_{12}$. Next, assuming that events $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $L_0 = d_{12}$ hold we consider L_k for $k = 1, 2$. The sum L_k counts pairs $w_i \to v_j$, for $i \ge 1$, $j \ge 3$, such that v_j is a neighbor of v_k witnessed by w_i. Generally, we have $L_k \ge d_k - 1 - d_{12}$. This inequality is strict if some common neighbor of v_1, v_2 witnessed by w_1 is also witnessed as a neighbor of v_k by some other attribute w_i, $i \ge 2$. The inequality is also strict in the case where some neighbor of v_k is witnessed by two or more distinct attributes. If we rule out both of these possibilities, we have the equality $L_k = d_k - 1 - d_{12}$. We introduce the corresponding undesired events

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{B}_{k0} &= \{\mathbb{I}_{ik}\mathbb{I}_{ij}\mathbb{I}_{1j} = 1 \text{ for some } 3 \le j \le n \text{ and } 2 \le i \le m\},\\
\mathcal{B}_{k1} &= \{\mathbb{I}_{i_1k}\mathbb{I}_{i_1j}\mathbb{I}_{i_2k}\mathbb{I}_{i_2j} = 1 \text{ for some } 3 \le j \le n \text{ and } 2 \le i_1 < i_2 \le m\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we conclude that if $\mathcal{A}_1$ holds and at least one of the following three relations fails

$$L_0 = d_{12}, \quad L_1 + L_0 = d_1 - 1, \quad L_2 + L_0 = d_2 - 1$$

then at least one of the events $\mathcal{B}_l, \mathcal{B}_{lj}$, $0 \le l \le 2$, $0 \le j \le 1$, occurs. Hence, we have

$$\big|\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{U}_{k_1,k_2} \cap \{d_{12} = r\} \cap \mathcal{A}_1) - \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{U}^*_{r,k_1-r,k_2-r} \cap \mathcal{A}_1)\big| \le \sum_{0\le l\le 2}\sum_{0\le j\le 1} \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{A}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_{lj}).$$

Next we prove that the quantity on the right is $o((nm)^{-1})$. For this purpose we estimate

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{A}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_{lj}) = \mathbf{E}\big(\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{A}_1)\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{B}_{lj})\big) \le (mn)^{-1}\mathbf{E}(Y_1Y_2X_1^2\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{B}_{lj})) \tag{27}$$

and show that for any realized values Y_1, Y_2, X_1 we have

$$\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{B}_{lj}) = o(1), \qquad \text{for} \qquad 0 \le l \le 2, \quad 0 \le j \le 1. \tag{28}$$

Since $\mathbf{P}^*(\cdot) \le 1$ and $\mathbf{E}Y_1Y_2X_1^2 < \infty$, Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem then implies the desired bound $\mathbf{E}(Y_1Y_2X_1^2\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{B}_{lj})) = o(1)$.
Let us show (28). For this purpose we write events $\mathcal{B}_{lj}$ in the form $\mathcal{B}_{lj} = \{S_{lj} \ge 1\}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} S_{00} &= \sum_{2\le i\le m} \mathbb{I}_{i1}\mathbb{I}_{i2}, & S_{01} &= \sum_{3\le j\le n}\sum_{2\le i_1\ne i_2\le m} \mathbb{I}_{i_11}\mathbb{I}_{i_1j}\mathbb{I}_{i_22}\mathbb{I}_{i_2j}, \\ S_{k0} &= \sum_{3\le j\le n}\sum_{2\le i\le m} \mathbb{I}_{ik}\mathbb{I}_{ij}\mathbb{I}_{1j}, & S_{k1} &= \sum_{3\le j\le n}\sum_{2\le i_1<i_2\le m} \mathbb{I}_{i_1k}\mathbb{I}_{i_1j}\mathbb{I}_{i_2k}\mathbb{I}_{i_2j}, \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

and apply the inequality

$$\mathbf{P}^\star(S_{lj} \ge 1) \le \varepsilon + \mathbf{P}^\star(\tilde{\mathbf{E}}S_{lj} \ge \varepsilon), \qquad \forall \varepsilon > 0. \tag{30}$$

Let us briefly explain (30). We apply the trivial inequality $Z \le \varepsilon + Z\mathbb{I}_{\{Z>\varepsilon\}}$ to the random variable $Z = \tilde{\mathbf{P}}(S_{lj} \ge 1)$ and obtain

$$\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(S_{lj} \ge 1) \le \varepsilon + \mathbb{I}_{\{\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(S_{lj}\ge 1)>\varepsilon\}} \le \varepsilon + \mathbb{I}_{\{\tilde{\mathbf{E}}S_{lj}>\varepsilon\}}. \tag{31}$$

The last inequality follows by Markov's inequality, $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(S_{lj} \ge 1) \le \tilde{\mathbf{E}}S_{lj}$. Taking $\mathbf{E}^\star$-expected values in (31) we arrive to (30) since $\mathbf{P}^\star(S_{lj} \ge 1) = \mathbf{E}^\star\big(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(S_{lj} \ge 1)\big)$.

Now, (28) follows from (30) and the fact that $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}S_{lj} = o_{P^\star}(1)$ for any realized values Y_1, Y_2, X_1. To show that the latter bound holds true we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{E}}S_{00} &\le \sum_{2\le i\le m} \lambda_{i1}\lambda_{i2} = Y_1Y_2n^{-1}\hat{a}_2 = o_{P^\star}(1), \\ \tilde{\mathbf{E}}S_{01} &\le \sum_{3\le j\le n}\sum_{2\le i_1\ne i_2\le m} \lambda_{i_11}\lambda_{i_1j}\lambda_{i_22}\lambda_{i_2j} \le Y_1Y_2(\hat{a}_2)^2\hat{b}_2n^{-1} = o_{P^\star}(1), \\ \tilde{\mathbf{E}}S_{k0} &\le \sum_{3\le j\le n}\sum_{2\le i\le m} \lambda_{ik}\lambda_{ij}\lambda_{1j} \le Y_1X_1\beta_n^{-1/2}\hat{a}_2\hat{b}_2n^{-1} = o_{P^\star}(1), \\ \tilde{\mathbf{E}}S_{k0} &\le \sum_{3\le j\le n}\sum_{2\le i_1<i_2\le m} \lambda_{i_1k}\lambda_{i_1j}\lambda_{i_2k}\lambda_{i_2j} \le Y_k^2(\hat{a}_2)^2\hat{b}_2n^{-1} = o_{P^\star}(1). \end{aligned}$$

Here we used the fact that $\mathbf{E}X_1^2 < \infty$ implies $\hat{a}_2 = O_P(1)$ and $\mathbf{E}Y_1 < \infty$ implies $\hat{b}_2n^{-1} = o_P(1)$.
Step 3. Here we prove (16). Denote

$$\Delta_1 = \mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{U}^*_{r,r_1,r_2}) - \mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{U}^{**}_{r,r_1,r_2}), \qquad \Delta_2 = \mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{A}_1) - \lambda_{11}\lambda_{12}.$$

From identities

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{U}^*_{r,r_1,r_2}\cap\mathcal{A}_1)=\mathbf{E}\big(\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{U}^*_{r,r_1,r_2})\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{A}_1)\big),\quad \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{U}^{**}_{r,r_1,r_2}\cap\mathcal{A}_1)=\mathbf{E}\big(\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{U}^{**}_{r,r_1,r_2})\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{A}_1)\big)$$

we obtain

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{U}^*_{r,r_1,r_2}\cap\mathcal{A}_1)-\lambda_{11}\lambda_{12}\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{U}^{**}_{r,r_1,r_2})=\mathbf{E}\big(\Delta_1\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{A}_1)\big)+\mathbf{E}\big(\Delta_2\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{U}^{**}_{r,r_1,r_2})\big). \tag{32}$$

We shall show in Lemma 2 below that for any realized values Y_1, Y_2, X_1 we have $\Delta_1 = o(1)$. This, together with the inequality $\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{A}_1)\le\lambda_{11}\lambda_{12}$ implies

$$\mathbf{E}(\Delta_1\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{A}_1))\le(nm)^{-1}\mathbf{E}(\Delta_1 Y_1Y_2X_1^2)=o((nm)^{-1}), \tag{33}$$

by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem. Furthermore, (23) implies

$$\big|\mathbf{E}\big(\Delta_2\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{U}^{**}_{r,r_1,r_2})\big)\big|\le\mathbf{E}|\Delta_2|\le(nm)^{-1}\mathbf{E}Y_1Y_2X_1^2(\bar{\mathbf{I}}_{11}+\bar{\mathbf{I}}_{12})=o((nm)^{-1}). \tag{34}$$

Collecting (33) and (34) in (32) we obtain (16).

Proof of (ii). The proof (7) is similar to that of (6). It makes use the observation that the typical adjacency relation is witnessed by a single attribute. One difference is that now the size of the collection of attributes, prescribed to the typical vertex, tends to infinity as $n, m\to+\infty$. Since our intersection graph is sparse, this implies that the number of vertices linked (in H) to any given single attribute is most likely 0, it is 1 with a small probability, but it is almost never larger than 1. As a consequence we obtain that $d_{12}=o_P(1)$. Another consequence is that the number of neighbors of a given vertex is distributed as Poisson mixture $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$, where random variable λ accounts for the size of the collection of attributes prescribed to the vertex.

The first several steps of the proof are the same as that of (6). Namely, relations (13), (14), (15) hold true as their proof remains valid for $m/n\to+\infty$. Further steps of the proof are a bit different. We show that

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{U}^*_{r,k_1-r,k_2-r}\cap\mathcal{A}_1)\approx 0,\qquad\text{for}\qquad r=1,2,\dots, \tag{35}$$

and

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{U}^*_{0,k_1,k_2}\cap\mathcal{A}_1)\approx\mathbf{P}(\{L_1=k_1,L_2=k_2\}\cap\mathcal{A}_1). \tag{36}$$

Finally, we show that

$$\mathbf{P}(\{L_1=k_1,L_2=k_2\}\cap\mathcal{A}_1)\approx\mathbf{E}\big(\lambda_{11}\lambda_{12}\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{U}^{***}_{k_1,k_2})\big). \tag{37}$$

Now the simple identity

$$a_2^{-1}b_1^{-2}nm\mathbf{E}\big(\lambda_{11}\lambda_{12}\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{U}^{***}_{k_1,k_2})\big)=\tilde{p}(k_1+1)\tilde{p}(k_2+1)$$

completes the proof of (7). It remains to prove (35), (36), (37).

Let us prove (35), (36). Denote $R'=\mathbf{P}(\{L_0\ge1\}\cap\mathcal{A}_1)$. Relations (35), (36) follow from inequalities

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{U}^*_{r,k_1-r,k_2-r}\cap\mathcal{A}_1)\le R',\qquad r=1,2,\dots, \tag{38}$$

$$0\le\mathbf{P}(\{L_1=k_1,L_2=k_2\}\cap\mathcal{A}_1)-\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{U}^*_{0,k_1,k_2}\cap\mathcal{A}_1)\le R', \tag{39}$$

and the bound $R' = o((nm)^{-1})$. To prove the latter bound we write

$$R' = \mathbf{E}\big(\mathbf{P}^\star(L_0 \geq 1)\mathbf{P}^\star(A_1)\big) \leq (nm)^{-1}\mathbf{E}(Y_1Y_2X_1^2\mathbf{P}^\star(L_0 \geq 1)) = o((nm)^{-1}). \tag{40}$$

Here we used inequalities $\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{A}_1) \leq \lambda_{11}\lambda_{12} \leq (nm)^{-1}Y_1Y_2X_1^2$ and the bound $\mathbf{E}(Y_1Y_2X_1^2\mathbf{P}^\star(L_0 \geq 1)) = o(1)$, which follows by Lebesque's dominated convergence theorem, since

$$\mathbf{P}^\star(L_0 \geq 1) \leq \mathbf{E}^\star L_0 \leq \sum_{3\leq j\leq n} \lambda_{1j} = b_1X_1((n-2)/n)\beta_n^{-1/2} = o(1).$$

Let us prove (37). The proof is similar to that of (16). We write

$$\mathbf{P}(\{L_1 = k_1, L_2 = k_2\} \cap \mathcal{A}_1) - \lambda_{11}\lambda_{12}\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{U}^{***}_{k_1,k_2}) = \mathbf{E}\big(\Delta_3\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{A}_1)\big) + \mathbf{E}\big(\Delta_2\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{U}^{***}_{k_1,k_2})\big), \tag{41}$$

where

$$\Delta_2 = \mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{A}_1) - \lambda_{11}\lambda_{12}, \qquad \Delta_3 = \mathbf{P}^\star(L_1 = k_1, L_2 = k_2) - \mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{U}^{***}_{k_1,k_2})$$

and show that both summands in the right of (41) are $o((nm)^{-1})$, cf. proof of (16) above. In fact, the only think what remains to show is that for any realized values Y_1, Y_2, X_1 we have $\Delta_3 = o(1)$. This is shown in Lemma 3 below.

□

Proof of Remark 1. Let us prove (i). Lemma 4 implies

$$\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_0 = r) \approx c_1^* r^{-\varkappa}, \qquad \text{where} \qquad c_1^* = c(b_1\beta^{-1/2})^{\varkappa-1}. \tag{42}$$

Consequently,

$$\mathbf{P}(\tau_1 = r) \approx ca_1^{-1}(b_1\beta^{-1/2})^{\varkappa-2}r^{1-\varkappa}. \tag{43}$$

From the latter relation we conclude that the sequence of probabilities $\{\mathbf{P}(\tau_1 = r)\}_{r\geq 0}$ is longtailed and subexponential, that is, it satisfies conditions of Theorem 4.30 of [11]. This theorem implies $\mathbf{P}(\sum_{1\leq i\leq \Lambda_1}\tau_i = r) \approx \mathbf{P}(\tau_1 = r)\mathbf{E}\Lambda_1$, thus completing the proof.
Let us prove (ii). We observe that τ_1 has Poisson distribution with mean $\lambda_0 = xb_1\beta^{-1/2}$. Hence, given Λ_1, the random variable d_* has Poisson distribution with mean $\lambda_0\Lambda_1$. Now statement (iii) of Lemma 4 implies that $\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_1 = r) \approx c_*r^{-\varkappa}$, where $c_* = c(a_1\beta^{1/2})^{\varkappa-1}$. Next, we apply statement (iii) of Lemma 4 once again and obtain $\mathbf{P}(d_* = r) \approx c_*\lambda_0^{\varkappa-1}r^{-\varkappa}$.
□

Proof of Remark 2. Let us prove (8). The proof is standard and simple. We present it here for reader's convenience. Let (v_1', v_2') denote an ordered pair of distinct vertices drawn uniformly at random and let $\mathbf{P}'$ and $\mathbf{E}'$ denote the conditional probability and expectation given all the random variables considered, but (v_1', v_2'). We have

$$\mathbf{P}(d(v_1) = r | v_1 \sim v_2) = \frac{\mathbf{P}(d(v_1) = r, v_1 \sim v_2)}{\mathbf{P}(v_1 \sim v_2)} = \frac{\mathbf{P}(d(v_1') = r, v_1' \sim v_2')}{\mathbf{P}(v_1 \sim v_2)}. \tag{44}$$

The denominator is evaluated in (17): We have

$$\mathbf{P}(\{v_1 \sim v_2\}) = n^{-1}a_2b_1^2 + o(n^{-1}) = n^{-1}\mathbf{E}\Lambda_3 + o(n^{-1}).$$

In the last step we used the simple identities $\mathbf{E}\Lambda_3 = \mathbf{E}\lambda_3 = a_2 b_1^2$. In order to evaluate the numerator we combine identities

$$\mathbf{P}'(d(v_1') = r, v_1' \sim v_2') = \mathbf{P}'(v_1' \sim v_2' | d(v_1') = r)\mathbf{P}'(d(v_1') = r) = \frac{r}{n-1}\mathbf{P}'(d(v_1') = r)$$
$$\mathbf{P}(d(v_1') = r, v_1' \sim v_2') = \mathbf{E}\big(\mathbf{P}'(d(v_1') = r, v_1' \sim v_2')\big).$$

We obtain $\mathbf{P}(d(v_1') = r, v_1' \sim v_2') = (r/(n-1))\mathbf{P}(d(v_1) = r)$. Hence, by (44),

$$\mathbf{P}(d(v_1) = r | v_1 \sim v_2) = r\mathbf{P}(d(v_1) = r)(\mathbf{E}\Lambda_3)^{-1} + o(1).$$

Now, the statement (ii) of Theorem 1 completes the proof of (8). □

Proof of Corollary 1. (i) follows from the relation $\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_3 = r) \approx c(a_2 b_1)^{\varkappa-1} r^{-\varkappa}$, see Lemma 4.
In the proof of (ii) and (iii) we assume that $k_1 \le k_2$ and use the notation

$$S_A = \sum_{r \in A} (r+1)(r+2)\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_0 = r+2) q_{k_1 - r} q_{k_2 - r}, \qquad A \in [0, k_1].$$

Let us prove (ii). We observe that $\mathbf{E}(e^{aY_1}) < \infty$ implies that $\mathbf{E}Y_1 e^{a'\Lambda_1} < \infty$ for some $a' > 0$. Using this observation and the fact that the sequence of probabilities $\{\mathbf{P}(\tau_1 = r)\}_{r \ge 0}$ is longtailed and subexponential (see (43) and [11]) we show that

$$\mathbf{E}\big(Y_1 \mathbf{P}(d^*_{Y_1} = r)\big) \approx \big(\mathbf{E}(Y_1 \Lambda_1)\big)\mathbf{P}(\tau_1 = r). \tag{45}$$

The proof of (45) is much the same as that of Theorem 4.30 in [11]. Now, we invoke in (45) the identity $\mathbf{E}(Y_1\Lambda_1) = \mathbf{E}(Y_1\lambda_1) = a_1 b_2 \beta^{1/2}$ and (43), and obtain

$$\mathbf{E}\big(Y_1 \mathbf{P}(d^*_{Y_1} = r)\big) \approx c_2^* r^{1-\varkappa}, \qquad \text{where} \qquad c_2^* = c b_1^{\varkappa-2} b_2 \beta^{(3-\varkappa)/2}.$$

Hence we have $q_r \approx c_2^* r^{1-\varkappa}$ and $\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_0 = r) \approx c_1^* r^{-\varkappa}$, see (42).
Now we are ready to prove (11). Let $\varepsilon = \ln(k_1 \wedge (k_2 - k_1))$ for $k_2 - k_1 \to +\infty$, and $\varepsilon = \ln k_1$ otherwise. Split $S_{[0,k_1]} = S_{A_1} + S_{A_2} + S_{A_3}$, where

$$A_1 = [0, k_1/2], \qquad A_2 = (k_1/2, k_1 - \varepsilon], \qquad A_3 = (k_1 - \varepsilon, k_1].$$

In the remaining part of the proof we shall show that S_{A_1}, S_{A_2} are negligibly small compared to S_{A_3} and determine the first order asymptotics of S_{A_3} as $k_1, k_2 \to +\infty$. We have for some $\bar{c} > 0$ (independent of k_1, k_2)

$$S_{A_1} \le \bar{c} \sum_{i \in A_1} \frac{1}{(k_1 - i)^{\varkappa-1}} \frac{1}{(k_2 - i)^{\varkappa-1}} \frac{1}{(1+i)^{\varkappa-2}} = O\Big(k_1^{4-2\varkappa} k_2^{1-\varkappa}(1 + \Delta)\Big).$$

Here $\Delta = \ln n$ for $\varkappa = 3$ and $\Delta = 0$ otherwise. Furthermore, for $k_2 - k_1$ bounded we have

$$S_{A_2} \le \frac{\bar{c}}{k_1^{\varkappa-2}} \sum_{i \in A_2} \frac{1}{(k_1 - i)^{2\varkappa-2}} = O\Big(\varepsilon^{3-2\varkappa} k_1^{2-\varkappa}\Big) = o(k_1^{2-\varkappa}).$$

For $k_2 - k_1 \to +\infty$ we have

$$S_{A_2} \le \frac{\bar c}{k_1^{\varkappa-2}} \sum_{i\in A_2} \frac{1}{(k_1-i)^{\varkappa-1}} \frac{1}{(k_2-i)^{\varkappa-1}} \le \frac{\bar c}{k_1^{\varkappa-2}(k_2-k_1)^{\varkappa-1}} \sum_{i\in A_2} \frac{1}{(k_1-i)^{\varkappa-1}}.$$

Since $\sum_{i\in A_2} \frac{1}{(k_1-i)^{\varkappa-1}} = O(\varepsilon^{2-\varkappa}) = o(1)$ we obtain $S_{A_2} = o\big(k_1^{2-\varkappa}(k_2-k_1)^{1-\varkappa}\big)$.
Finally, using the approximation $(i+1)(i+2)\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_0 = i+2) \approx c_1^* k_1^{2-\varkappa}$ uniformly in $i \in A_3$ we obtain for $k_2 - k_1 \to +\infty$

$$S_{A_3} = \frac{c_1^*(1+o(1))}{k_1^{\varkappa-2}} \sum_{i\in A_3} q_{k_1-i} q_{k_2-i} \approx \frac{c_1^*}{k_1^{\varkappa-2}} \frac{c_2^*}{(k_2-k_1)^{\varkappa-1}} \sum_{i\in A_3} q_{k_1-i} \approx \frac{c_1^* c_2^*}{k_1^{\varkappa-2}(k_2-k_1)^{\varkappa-1}}.$$

Similarly, in the case where $k_2 - k_1 = k$ for some fixed k we have

$$S_{A_3} = \frac{c_1^*(1+o(1))}{k_1^{\varkappa-2}} \sum_{i\in A_3} q_{k_1-i} q_{k_2-i} \approx \frac{c_1^* c_{3,k}^*}{k_1^{\varkappa-2}}, \quad \text{where} \quad c_{3,k}^* = \sum_{i\ge 0} q_i q_{k+i}.$$

Let us prove (iii). We observe that Λ_0 has the Poisson distribution with (non-random) mean λ_0. Using the identity $(r+1)(r+2)\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_0 = r+2) = \lambda_0^2 \mathbf{P}(\Lambda_0 = r)$ we write

$$S_{[0,k_1]} = \lambda_0^2 \sum_{r=0}^{k_1} \mathbf{P}(\Lambda_0 = r) q_{k_1-r} q_{k_2-r} = \lambda_0^2 \mathbf{E}\big(q_{k_1-\Lambda_0} q_{k_2-\Lambda_0}\big) = \lambda_0^2 (J_1 + J_2),$$
$$J_1 = \mathbf{E}\big(q_{k_1-\Lambda_0} q_{k_2-\Lambda_0}\big)\mathbb{I}_{\{\Lambda_0 < \sqrt{k_1}\}}, \qquad J_2 = \mathbf{E}\big(q_{k_1-\Lambda_0} q_{k_2-\Lambda_0}\big)\mathbb{I}_{\{\sqrt{k_1} \le \Lambda_0 \le k_1\}}.$$

Next, combining the fast decay of Poisson tail probability $\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_0 > t)$ as $t \to +\infty$ with the relation, which is shown below,

$$q_r \approx c_0 r^{1-\varkappa}, \qquad c_0 = c(x^2 b_1)^{\varkappa-2}, \tag{46}$$

we estimate $J_1 = (1+o(1))c_0^2 (k_1 k_2)^{1-\varkappa}$ and $J_2 = o((k_1 k_2)^{1-\varkappa}$. We obtain that $S_{[0,1]} = (1+o(1))\lambda_0^2 J_1$. Now the identity $p_\beta(k_1,k_2) = \beta b_1^{-4} x^{-2} S_{[0,k_1]}$ completes the proof of (11).
Now, we prove (46). Since τ_1 has Poisson distribution with mean $\lambda_0 = x b_1 \beta^{-1/2}$, we obtain

$$\mathbf{P}(d_y^* = k) = \mathbf{E}\Big(e^{-\lambda_0\Lambda_1} \frac{(\lambda_0\Lambda_1)^k}{k!} \Big| Y_1 = y\Big) = \sum_{i\ge 0} e^{-\lambda_0 i} \frac{(\lambda_0 i)^k}{k!} e^{-By} \frac{(By)^i}{i!}.$$

Here we denote $B = x\beta^{1/2}$. After we write the product $y\mathbf{P}(d_y^* = k)$ in the form

$$\sum_{i\ge 0} e^{-\lambda_0 i} \frac{(\lambda_0 i)^k}{k!} e^{-By} \frac{(By)^{i+1}}{(i+1)!} \frac{i+1}{B} = \mathbf{E}\Big(e^{-\lambda_0(\Lambda_1-1)} \frac{(\lambda_0(\Lambda_1-1))^k}{k!} \frac{\Lambda_1}{B} \mathbb{I}_{\{\Lambda_1\ge 1\}} \Big| Y_1 = y\Big)$$

we obtain the following expression for the expectation $q_k = \mathbf{E}\big(Y_1 \mathbf{P}(d_{Y_1}^* = k)\big)$

$$q_k = \frac{\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_1 \ge 1)}{B}(I_{1,k} + I_{2,k}), \quad I_{1,k} = \mathbf{E}\Big(e^{-\lambda_0 Z} \frac{(\lambda_0 Z)^k}{k!}\Big), \quad I_{2,k} = \mathbf{E}\Big(Z e^{-\lambda_0 Z} \frac{(\lambda_0 Z)^k}{k!}\Big). \tag{47}$$

Here Z denotes a random variable with the distribution

$$\mathbf{P}(Z=r)=\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_1=r+1)/\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_1\geq 1),\qquad r=0,1,\dots.$$

We note that

$$\mathbf{P}(Z=r)\approx c'r^{-\varkappa},\qquad \text{where}\qquad c'=cB^{\varkappa-1}/\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_1\geq 1). \tag{48}$$

Indeed, (48) follows from the relation $\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_1=r)\approx cB^{\varkappa-1}r^{-\varkappa}$, which is a simply consequence of the property $\mathcal{A}_{c,\varkappa}$ of the distribution of Y_1, see Lemma 4. Next, we show that

$$I_{1,k}\approx c'\lambda_0^{\varkappa-1}k^{-\varkappa},\qquad I_{2,k}\approx c'\lambda_0^{\varkappa-2}k^{1-\varkappa}. \tag{49}$$

The first relation follows from (48), by Lemma 4. The second relation follows from the first one via the simple identity $I_{2,k}=(k+1)\lambda_0^{-1}I_{1,k+1}$. Finally invoking (49) in (47) we obtain (46).

□

3 Appendix A

Here we prove the bounds $\Delta_1=o(1)$ and $\Delta_3=o(1)$, see (32) and (41) above. In the proof we apply and further extend the approach of [4]. An important tool used below is the following inequality referred to as LeCam's lemma, see e.g., [22].

Lemma 1. *Let $S=\mathbb{I}_1+\mathbb{I}_2+\dots+\mathbb{I}_n$ be the sum of independent random indicators with probabilities $\mathbf{P}(\mathbb{I}_i=1)=p_i$. Let Λ be Poisson random variable with mean $p_1+\dots+p_n$. The total variation distance between the distributions P_S of P_Λ of S and Λ*

$$\sup_{A\subset\{0,1,2\dots\}}|\mathbf{P}(S\in A)-\mathbf{P}(\Lambda\in A)|=\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k\geq 0}|\mathbf{P}(S=k)-\mathbf{P}(\Lambda=k)|\leq\sum_i p_i^2. \tag{50}$$

Lemma 2. *Assume that conditions of part (i) of Theorem 2 are satisfied. Then for any realized values Y_1,Y_2,X_1 and any integers $r,r_1,r_2\geq 0$ we have*

$$\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{U}^*_{r,r_1,r_2})-\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{U}^{**}_{r,r_1,r_2})=o(1). \tag{51}$$

Proof of Lemma 2. Denote

$$\mathbf{L}^{(0)}=(L_0^{(0)},L_1^{(0)},L_2^{(0)}):=(L_0,L_1,L_2),\qquad \mathbf{L}^{(4)}=(L_0^{(4)},L_1^{(4)},L_2^{(4)}):=(\Lambda_0,d^*_{Y_1},d^*_{Y_2}).$$

In the proof we construct random vectors $\mathbf{L}^{(h)}=(L_0^{(h)},L_1^{(h)},L_2^{(h)})$, $h=1,2,3$, defined on the same probability space as Y_1,Y_2,X_1 such that for any realized values Y_1,Y_2,X_1 we have

$$d^\star_{TV}(\mathbf{L}^{(h)},\mathbf{L}^{(h+1)})=o(1),\qquad h=0,1, \tag{52}$$

$$\mathbf{P}^\star\big(\mathbf{L}^{(h)}=(r,r_1,r_2)\big)-\mathbf{P}^\star\big(\mathbf{L}^{(h+1)}=(r,r_1,r_2)\big)=o(1),\qquad h=2,3, \tag{53}$$

for any integers $r,r_1,r_2\geq 0$. We note that (52), (53) imply (51).

Let us define random vectors $\mathbf{L}^{(h)}$, $h=1,2,3$. Given X,Y, let $\{\eta_{ki}\}_{i=2}^m$, $k=1,2$ and $\{\xi_{hi}\}_{i=1}^m$, $h=2,3$, be sequences of Poisson random variables which are (conditionally, given X,Y) independent within each sequence and have mean values

$$\tilde{\mathbf{E}}\eta_{ki}=\lambda_{ki},\qquad \tilde{\mathbf{E}}\xi_{2i}=\sum_{3\le j\le n}\lambda_{ij},\tilde{\mathbf{E}}\xi_{3i}=\frac{b_1}{\sqrt{\beta}}X_i.$$

In addition, we assume that (conditionally, given X,Y) the sequences $\{\eta_{ki}\}_{i=2}^m$, $k=1,2$, are independent and they are independent of the sequences $\{\xi_{hi}\}_{i=1}^m$, $h=2,3,4$. Denote for $k=1,2$ and $h=2,3$

$$L_0^{(1)}=u_1,\qquad L_0^{(h)}=\xi_{h1},\qquad L_k^{(1)}=\sum_{2\le i\le m}\eta_{ki}u_i,\qquad L_k^{(h)}=\sum_{2\le i\le m}\eta_{ki}\xi_{hi}.$$

Let us prove (52) for $h=0$. In the proof we use the following simple inequalities. Let $\tilde{d}^*_{TV}(\zeta,\theta)$ denote the total variation distance between the conditional distributions of random variables/vectors ζ and θ given $X,Y,u_1,\dots,u_m$. Then we have

$$\tilde{d}_{TV}(\zeta,\theta)\le\tilde{\mathbf{E}}\tilde{d}^*_{TV}(\zeta,\theta),\qquad d^\star_{TV}(\zeta,\theta)\le\mathbf{E}^\star\tilde{d}_{TV}(\zeta,\theta)\le\mathbf{E}^\star\tilde{d}^*_{TV}(\zeta,\theta).\tag{54}$$

Introduce random variables for $k=1,2$ and $t=1,\dots,m$

$$L_k^{[t]}=\sum_{2\le i\le t}\mathbb{I}_{ik}u_i+\sum_{t+1\le i\le m}\eta_{ki}u_i.$$

Note that $L_k^{[1]}=L_k^{(1)}$ and $L_k^{[m]}=L_k^{(0)}$. We have, by the triangle inequality,

$$\tilde{d}^*_{TV}(L_k^{[1]},L_k^{[m]})\le\sum_{2\le t\le m}\tilde{d}^*_{TV}(L_k^{[t-1]},L_k^{[t]})\le\sum_{t=2}^m\lambda_{tk}^2.$$

Here we estimated each summand

$$\tilde{d}^*_{TV}(L_k^{[t-1]},L_k^{[t]})\le\tilde{d}^*_{TV}(\mathbb{I}_{tk},\eta_{kt})\le\lambda_{tk}^2.\tag{55}$$

In the first inequality of (55) we use the fact that $L_k^{[t-1]}$ and $L_k^{[t]}$ only differ in the t-th summand. The second inequality is trivial for $\lambda_{tk}\ge 1$ and it follows by LeCam's inequality, see Lemma 1, for $\lambda_{tk}<1$.

Next, we use the fact that given $X,Y,u_1,\dots,u_m$ the random vectors $\mathbf{L}^{(0)}$ and $\mathbf{L}^{(1)}$ have conditionally independent marginals. In particular, we can apply the triangle inequality

$$\tilde{d}^*_{TV}(\mathbf{L}^{(0)},\mathbf{L}^{(1)})\le\sum_{0\le k\le 2}\tilde{d}^*_{TV}(L_k^{(0)},L_k^{(1)})\le\sum_{2\le t\le m}(\lambda_{t1}^2+\lambda_{t2}^2).$$

In the last step we use $\tilde{d}^*_{TV}(L_0^{(0)},L_0^{(1)})=0$. Finally, (54) implies

$$d^\star_{TV}(\mathbf{L}^{(0)},\mathbf{L}^{(1)})\le\mathbf{E}^\star\sum_{2\le t\le m}(\lambda_{t1}^2+\lambda_{t2}^2)=\frac{2}{n}\frac{m-2}{m}a_2(Y_1^2+Y_2^2)=o(1).$$

Let us prove (52) for $h = 1$. We note that conditionally, given X, Y, the random variable $L_0^{(1)}$ is independent of $(L_1^{(1)}, L_2^{(1)})$, and $L_0^{(2)}$ is independent of $(L_1^{(2)}, L_2^{(2)})$. Hence, we have, by triangle inequality,

$$\tilde{d}_{TV}\big(\mathbf{L}^{(1)}, \mathbf{L}^{(2)}\big) \le \tilde{d}_{TV}(L_0^{(1)}, L_0^{(2)}) + \tilde{d}_{TV}\big((L_1^{(1)}, L_2^{(1)}), (L_1^{(2)}, L_2^{(2)})\big) =: Z_1 + Z_2.$$

We shall show that $\mathbf{E}^\star Z_i = o(1)$, $i = 1, 2$. These bounds combined with the second inequality of (54) imply $d_{TV}^\star\big(\mathbf{L}^{(1)}, \mathbf{L}^{(2)}\big) = o(1)$.
We firstly estimate Z_1. We have

$$Z_1 = \tilde{d}_{TV}(u_1, \xi_{21}) \le \sum_{3 \le j \le n} \lambda_{1j}^2 = \beta_n^{-1} X_1^2 \hat{b}_2 n^{-1}. \tag{56}$$

Indeed, for $\max_j \lambda_{1j} < 1$ this inequality follows by Lemma 1. Otherwise the inequality is trivial, since the total variation distance is always less than or equal to 1. Next, we use the fact that $\mathbf{E}Y_1 < \infty$ implies $\hat{b}_2 n^{-1} = o_P(1)$. We obtain $Z_1 = o_{P^\star}(1)$. This bound together with the inequality $Z_1 \le 1$ implies $\mathbf{E}^\star Z_1 = o(1)$.
We secondly estimate Z_2. Introduce random variables for $k = 1, 2$ and $t = 1, \dots, m$

$$L_k^{\{t\}} = \sum_{2 \le i \le t} \eta_{ki} u_i + \sum_{t+1 \le i \le m} \eta_{ki} \xi_{2i}.$$

Note that $L_k^{\{1\}} = L_k^{(2)}$ and $L_k^{\{m\}} = L_k^{(1)}$. We apply triangle inequality

$$\tilde{d}_{TV}\big((L_1^{\{m\}}, L_2^{\{m\}}), (L_1^{\{1\}}, L_2^{\{1\}})\big) \le \sum_{t=2}^{m} \tilde{d}_{TV}\big((L_1^{\{t-1\}}, L_2^{\{t-1\}}), (L_1^{\{t\}}, L_2^{\{t\}})\big) \tag{57}$$

and estimate each summand as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{d}_{TV}\big((L_1^{\{t-1\}}, L_2^{\{t-1\}}), (L_1^{\{t\}}, L_2^{\{t\}})\big) &\le \tilde{d}_{TV}\big((u_t\eta_{t1}, u_t\eta_{t2}), (\xi_{2t}\eta_{t1}, \xi_{2t}\eta_{t2})\big) && (58)\\
&\le \tilde{\mathbf{P}}\big((\eta_{t1}, \eta_{t2}) \ne (0,0)\big)\tilde{d}_{TV}(u_t, \xi_{2t}) && (59)\\
&\le (\lambda_{t1} + \lambda_{t2}) \min\big\{1,\ \beta_n^{-1} X_t^2 \hat{b}_2 n^{-1}\big\}. && (60)
\end{aligned}$$

In (58) we use the fact that $L_k^{\{t-1\}}$ and $L_k^{\{t\}}$ only differ in the t-th summand. In (59) we first estimate the total variation distance between conditional distributions of $(u_t\eta_{t1}, u_t\eta_{t2})$ and $(\xi_{2t}\eta_{t1}, \xi_{2t}\eta_{t2})$ given $\eta_{t1}, \eta_{t2}, X, Y$ from above by $\mathbb{I}_{\{(\eta_{t1}, \eta_{t2}) \ne (0,0)\}} \tilde{d}_{TV}(u_t, \xi_{2t})$ and then take the expected value $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}$. In (60) we estimate $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}\big((\eta_{t1}, \eta_{t2}) \ne (0,0)\big) \le \lambda_{t1} + \lambda_{t2}$. This bound is trivial for $\lambda_{t1} + \lambda_{t2} \ge 1$. Otherwise it follows from the inequalities

$$\tilde{\mathbf{P}}\big((\eta_{t1}, \eta_{t2}) \ne (0,0)\big) \le \tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\eta_{t1} \ne 0) + \tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\eta_{t2} \ne 0) = e^0 - e^{-\lambda_{t1}} + e^0 - e^{-\lambda_{t2}} \le \lambda_{t1} + \lambda_{t2}.$$

In(60) we invoke the inequality $\tilde{d}_{TV}(u_t, \xi_{2t}) \le \min\big\{1,\ \beta_n^{-1} X_t^2 \hat{b}_2 n^{-1}\big\}$, cf. (56) above.

Next, using the identities $L_k^{\{1\}} = L_k^{(2)}$ and $L_k^{\{m\}} = L_k^{(1)}$ we obtain from (57), (60) that

$$Z_2 \le \sum_{t=2}^{m} (\lambda_{t1} + \lambda_{t2}) \min\big\{1,\ \frac{X_t^2 \hat{b}_2}{\beta_n n}\big\} = (Y_1 + Y_2)\beta_n^{1/2} \sum_{t=2}^{m} \frac{X_t}{m}\big\{1,\ \frac{X_t^2 \hat{b}_2}{\beta_n n}\big\}. \tag{61}$$

Finally, we have,

$$\mathbf{E}^\star Z_2 = \beta^{1/2}(Y_1+Y_2)\mathbf{E}^\star X_2\big\{1,\, X_2^2\hat{b}_2\beta_n^{-1}n^{-1}\big\} = \beta^{1/2}(Y_1+Y_2)\mathbf{E}X_2\big\{1,\, X_2^2\hat{b}_2\beta_n^{-1}n^{-1}\big\} = o(1),$$

since $\hat{b}_2$ is independent of X_2 and $\mathbf{E}X_2 < \infty$, and $\hat{b}_2 n^{-1} = o_P(1)$.

Let us prove (53) for $h = 2$. Given X, Y, let $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^m$, $\{\Delta_i'\}_{i=1}^m$, $\{\Delta_i''\}_{i=1}^m$ be independent Poisson random variables, which are independent of $\{\eta_{i1}\}_{i=2}^m$, $\{\eta_{i2}\}_{i=2}^m$, and have mean values

$$\tilde{\mathbf{E}}\xi_i = bX_i, \qquad \tilde{\mathbf{E}}\Delta_i' = \delta' X_i, \qquad \tilde{\mathbf{E}}\Delta_i'' = \delta'' X_i, \qquad 1 \le i \le m. \tag{62}$$

Here $\delta' = \hat{b}_1\beta_n^{-1/2} - b$ and $\delta' = b_1\beta^{-1/2} - b$, and $b = \min\{\hat{b}_1\beta_n^{-1/2}, b_1\beta^{-1/2}\}$. Define the random vectors $\bar{\mathbf{L}}^{(2)}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{L}}^{(3)}$ in the same way as $\mathbf{L}^{(2)}$ and $\mathbf{L}^{(3)}$ above, but with ξ_{2i} and ξ_{3i} replaced by $\bar{\xi}_{2i} = \xi_i + \Delta_i'$ and $\bar{\xi}_{3i} = \xi_i + \Delta_i''$ respectively. We note that given Y_1, Y_2, X_1 the random vector $\bar{\mathbf{L}}^{(2)}$ has the same conditional distribution as $\mathbf{L}^{(2)}$, and $\bar{\mathbf{L}}^{(3)}$ has the same conditional distribution as $\mathbf{L}^{(3)}$. Hence in order to prove (53) for $h = 2$ it suffices to show that for any realized values Y_1, Y_2, X_1 we have

$$\mathbf{P}^\star(|\bar{L}_k^{(2)} - \bar{L}_k^{(3)}| \ge 1) = o(1), \qquad k = 0, 1, 2. \tag{63}$$

Here $\bar{L}_k^{(i)}$ denotes the k-th coordinate of the vector $\bar{\mathbf{L}}^{(i)}$. We derive (63) from the bounds $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}|\bar{L}_k^{(2)} - \bar{L}_k^{(3)}| = o_{P^\star}(1)$ using (30). To prove these bounds we calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{\mathbf{E}}|\bar{L}_0^{(2)} - \bar{L}_0^{(3)}| = (\delta' + \delta'')X_1,\\
&\tilde{\mathbf{E}}|\bar{L}_k^{(2)} - \bar{L}_k^{(3)}| = \sum_{2\le i\le m} \tilde{\mathbf{E}}\eta_{ki}(\delta' + \delta'')X_i = \beta_n^{1/2} Y_k \hat{a}_2(\delta' + \delta''), \qquad k = 1, 2
\end{aligned}$$

and use the fact that $\delta' + \delta'' = |\hat{b}_1\beta_n^{-1/2} - b_1\beta^{-1/2}| = o_P(1)$. Indeed, we have $\beta_n \to \beta$ and, by the law of large numbers, $\hat{b}_1 - b_1 = o_P(1)$.

Let us prove (53) for $h = 3$. We note that $L_0^{(3)}$ has the same distribution as Λ_0. Furthermore, given Y_1, Y_2, X_1, the random variable $L_0^{(3)}$ is conditionally independent of $(L_1^{(3)}, L_2^{(3)})$. Hence, it suffices to show that $\mathbf{P}^*((L_1^{(3)}, L_2^{(3)}) = (r_1, r_2)) - \mathbf{P}^*((L_1^{(4)}, L_2^{(4)}) = (r_1, r_2)) = o(1)$ for any integers $r_1, r_2 \ge 0$. For this purpose we prove the convergence of the conditional characteristic functions

$$\mathbf{E}^\star e^{\mathbf{i}tL_1^{(3)} + \mathbf{i}sL_2^{(3)}} \to \mathbf{E}^\star e^{\mathbf{i}tL_1^{(4)} + \mathbf{i}sL_2^{(4)}}, \qquad \forall s, t \in (-\infty, +\infty). \tag{64}$$

Here $\mathbf{i}$ denotes the imaginary unit.

In the proof of (64) we exploit the compound Poisson structure of the distributions of $L_k^{(h)}$, $h = 2, 3$, $k = 1, 2$. Using the fact that, given Y_1, Y_2, X_1, the marginals of $(L_1^{(4)}, L_2^{(4)})$ are conditionally independent and have compound Poisson distributions, we write the characteristics function in the form

$$\mathbf{E}^\star e^{\mathbf{i}tL_1^{(4)} + \mathbf{i}sL_2^{(4)}} = \big(\mathbf{E}^\star e^{\mathbf{i}tL_1^{(4)}}\big) \cdot \big(\mathbf{E}^\star e^{\mathbf{i}sL_2^{(4)}}\big) = e^{(f_\tau(t)-1)\lambda_1} \cdot e^{(f_\tau(s)-1)\lambda_2}. =: f_1(t) \cdot f_2(s). \tag{65}$$

Here $f_\tau(t) = \mathbf{E}e^{it\tau}$ denotes the characteristic function of τ. Similarly, using the fact that given $X, Y, \xi_{32}, \ldots, \xi_{3m}$ the marginals of $(L_1^{(3)}, L_2^{(3)})$ are conditionally independent and

have compound Poisson distributions, we write the conditional characteristics function in the form

$$\hat{\mathbf{E}}e^{\mathbf{i}tL_1^{(3)}+\mathbf{i}sL_2^{(3)}} = \big(\hat{\mathbf{E}}e^{\mathbf{i}tL_1^{(3)}}\big)\cdot\big(\hat{\mathbf{E}}e^{\mathbf{i}sL_2^{(3)}}\big) = e^{(\hat{f}_\tau(t)-1)\hat{\lambda}_1}\cdot e^{(\hat{f}_\tau(s)-1)\hat{\lambda}_2} =: g_1(t)\cdot g_2(s). \qquad (66)$$

Here $\hat{\mathbf{E}}$ denotes the conditional expectation given $X, Y, \xi_{32}, \dots, \xi_{3m}$. Furthermore, we denote $\hat{\lambda}_k = \sum_{2\le j\le m}\lambda_{jk}$ and

$$\hat{f}_\tau(t) = \sum_{r\ge 0} e^{itr}\hat{p}_r, \qquad \text{where} \qquad \hat{p}_r = \hat{\lambda}_1^{-1}\sum_{2\le j\le m}\lambda_{j1}\mathbb{I}_{\{\xi_{3j}=r\}}.$$

We observe that $\hat{\lambda}_k = Y_k\hat{a}_1\sqrt{\beta_n}$ and each ratio $\lambda_{jk}/\hat{\lambda}_k = X_j/\hat{a}_1$ does not depend on $k = 1, 2$.

Finally, using (65), (66) we write

$$\mathbf{E}^\star e^{\mathbf{i}tL_1^{(3)}+\mathbf{i}sL_2^{(3)}} - \mathbf{E}^\star e^{\mathbf{i}tL_1^{(4)}+\mathbf{i}sL_2^{(4)}} = \mathbf{E}^\star\big(g_1(t)-f_1(t)\big)g_2(s) + \mathbf{E}^\star\big(g_2(s)-f_2(s)\big)f_1(t)$$

and invoke the bounds $\mathbf{E}^\star\big(g_1(t)-f_1(t)\big)g_2(s) = o(1)$ and $\mathbf{E}^\star\big(g_2(s)-f_2(s)\big)f_1(t) = o(1)$, which are obtained in the same way as relation (22) in [4]. We note that the proof of (22) in [4] uses the moment conditions $\mathbf{E}X_1^2 < \infty$, $\mathbf{E}Y_1 < \infty$ that are assumed to hold in the statement of our Theorem 2. □

Lemma 3. *Assume that conditions of part (ii) of Theorem 2 are satisfied. Then for any realized values Y_1, Y_2, X_1 and any integers $k_1, k_2 \ge 0$ we have*

$$\mathbf{P}^\star(L_1 = k_1, L_2 = k_2) - \mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{U}^{***}_{k_1,k_2}) = o(1). \qquad (67)$$

Proof of Lemma 3. Before the proof we introduce some notation. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. For $2 \le i \le m$ denote

$$\mathbb{I}'_i = \mathbb{I}'_i(\varepsilon) = \mathbb{I}_{\{X_i\beta_n^{-1/2}b_1<\varepsilon\}}, \quad \gamma_i = X_i\beta_n^{-1/2}b_1\mathbb{I}'_i \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_k = \sum_{2\le i\le m}\lambda_{ik}\gamma_i, \quad k = 1, 2.$$

Given X, Y, let $\tilde{\mathbb{I}}_2, \dots, \tilde{\mathbb{I}}_m$ be independent Bernoulli random variables with success probabilities

$$\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\tilde{\mathbb{I}}_i = 1) = 1 - \tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\tilde{\mathbb{I}}_i = 0) = \gamma_i,$$

and let $\bar{\xi}_{hi}$, $2 \le i \le m$, $h = 1, 2$, be independent Poisson random variables with mean values

$$\tilde{\mathbf{E}}\bar{\xi}_{1i} = \sum_{3\le j\le n}\lambda_{ij}, \qquad \tilde{\mathbf{E}}\bar{\xi}_{2i} = \frac{b_1}{\sqrt{\beta_n}}X_i.$$

We assume that given X, Y the sequences $\{\mathbb{I}_i\}_{i=2}^m$, $\{\tilde{\mathbb{I}}_i\}_{i=2}^m$, and $\{\bar{\xi}_{hi}\}_{i=2}^m$, $h = 1, 2$ are independent. Next, we introduce random vectors $\bar{\mathbf{L}}^{(h)} = (\bar{L}_1^{(h)}, \bar{L}_2^{(h)})$, $0 \le h \le 6$. Denote

$$\bar{\mathbf{L}}^{(0)} = (\bar{L}_1^{(0)}, \bar{L}_2^{(0)}) := (L_1, L_2), \qquad \bar{\mathbf{L}}^{(6)} = (\bar{L}_1^{(6)}, \bar{L}_2^{(6)}) := (\Lambda_3, \Lambda_4).$$

For $k = 1, 2$ and $h = 1, 2$ denote

$$\bar{L}_k^{(h)} = \sum_{2\le i\le m}\mathbb{I}_{ik}\bar{\xi}_{hi}, \qquad \bar{L}_k^{(3)} = \sum_{2\le i\le m}\mathbb{I}_{ik}\mathbb{I}'_i\bar{\xi}_{2i}, \qquad \bar{L}_k^{(4)} = \sum_{2\le i\le m}\mathbb{I}_{ik}\tilde{\mathbb{I}}_i.$$

Furthermore, given X, Y, let $\bar{L}_1^{(5)}$ and $\bar{L}_2^{(5)}$ be independent Poisson random variables with mean values $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}\bar{L}_k^{(5)} = \theta_k$.
We shall show below that for any integers $r_1, r_2 \geq 0$ we have

$$d_{TV}^{\star}(\mathbf{L}^{(0)}, \mathbf{L}^{(1)}) = o(1), \tag{68}$$
$$\mathbf{P}^{\star}\big(\bar{\mathbf{L}}^{(1)} = (r_1, r_2)\big) - \mathbf{P}^{\star}\big(\bar{\mathbf{L}}^{(2)} = (r_1, r_2)\big) = o(1), \tag{69}$$
$$\mathbf{E}^{\star}|L_k^{(2)} - L_k^{(3)}| = o(1), \qquad k = 1, 2, \tag{70}$$
$$d_{TV}^{\star}(\mathbf{L}^{(3)}, \mathbf{L}^{(4)}) \leq \varepsilon(Y_1 + Y_2)a_2 b_1, \tag{71}$$
$$\big|\mathbf{P}^{\star}\big(\bar{\mathbf{L}}^{(4)} = (r_1, r_2)\big) - \mathbf{P}^{\star}\big(\bar{\mathbf{L}}^{(6)} = (r_1, r_2)\big)\big| \leq \varepsilon(Y_1 + Y_2)a_2 b_1 + o(1). \tag{72}$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ can be chosen arbitrarily small, relations (68), (69), (70), (71), and (72) imply (67).

Let us prove (68). Introduce random variables

$$\bar{L}_k^{\{t\}} = \sum_{2 \leq i \leq t} \mathbb{I}_{ik} u_i + \sum_{t+1 \leq i \leq m} \mathbb{I}_{ik} \bar{\xi}_{1i}, \qquad t = 1, \ldots, m, \quad k = 1, 2.$$

Note that $\bar{L}_k^{\{1\}} = \bar{L}_k^{(1)}$ and $\bar{L}_k^{\{m\}} = \bar{L}_k^{(0)}$. We apply triangle inequality

$$\tilde{d}_{TV}\big((\bar{L}_1^{\{m\}}, \bar{L}_2^{\{m\}}), (\bar{L}_1^{\{1\}}, \bar{L}_2^{\{1\}})\big) \leq \sum_{t=2}^{m} \tilde{d}_{TV}\big((\bar{L}_1^{\{t-1\}}, \bar{L}_2^{\{t-1\}}), (\bar{L}_1^{\{t\}}, \bar{L}_2^{\{t\}})\big) \tag{73}$$

and estimate each summand as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{d}_{TV}\big((\bar{L}_1^{\{t-1\}}, \bar{L}_2^{\{t-1\}}), (\bar{L}_1^{\{t\}}, \bar{L}_2^{\{t\}})\big) &\leq \tilde{d}_{TV}\big((\mathbb{I}_{t1}u_t, \mathbb{I}_{t2}u_t), (\mathbb{I}_{t1}\bar{\xi}_{1t}, \mathbb{I}_{t2}\bar{\xi}_{1t})\big) && (74)\\
&\leq \tilde{\mathbf{P}}\big((\mathbb{I}_{t1}, \mathbb{I}_{t2}) \neq (0,0)\big)\tilde{d}_{TV}(u_t, \bar{\xi}_{1t}) && (75)\\
&\leq (\lambda_{t1} + \lambda_{t2})\beta_n^{-1/2} X_t (\hat{b}_2 n^{-1})^{1/2}. && (76)
\end{aligned}$$

In (74) we use the fact that $\bar{L}_k^{\{t-1\}}$ and $\bar{L}_k^{\{t\}}$ only differ in the t-th summand. In (75) we first estimate the total variation distance between conditional distributions of $(\mathbb{I}_{t1}u_t, \mathbb{I}_{t2}u_t)$ and $(\mathbb{I}_{t1}\bar{\xi}_{1t}, \mathbb{I}_{t2}\bar{\xi}_{1t})$ given $\mathbb{I}_{t1}, \mathbb{I}_{t2}, X, Y$ from above by $\mathbb{I}_{\{(\eta_{t1}, \eta_{t2}) \neq (0,0)\}}\tilde{d}_{TV}(u_t, \bar{\xi}_{1t})$ and then take the expected value $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}$. In (76) we estimate $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}\big((\mathbb{I}_{t1}, \mathbb{I}_{t2}) \neq (0,0)\big) \leq \lambda_{t1} + \lambda_{t2}$ and invoke the inequality

$$\tilde{d}_{TV}(u_t, \bar{\xi}_{1t}) \leq \min\big\{1,\, \beta_n^{-1} X_t^2 \hat{b}_2 n^{-1}\big\} \leq \big(\beta_n^{-1} X_t^2 \hat{b}_2 n^{-1}\big)^{1/2},$$

cf. (56) above.

Next, using the identities $\bar{L}_k^{\{1\}} = \bar{L}_k^{(1)}$ and $\bar{L}_k^{\{m\}} = \bar{L}_k^{(0)}$ we obtain from (73), (76) that

$$\tilde{d}_{TV}(\bar{\mathbf{L}}^{(0)}, \bar{\mathbf{L}}^{(1)}) \leq \sum_{t=2}^{m} (\lambda_{t1} + \lambda_{t2})\beta_n^{-1/2} X_t (\hat{b}_2 n^{-1})^{1/2} = (Y_1 + Y_2)\hat{a}_2 (\hat{b}_2/n)^{1/2}. \tag{77}$$

Finally, since $\mathbf{E}X_1^2 < \infty$ and $\mathbf{E}Y_1 < \infty$ imply $\hat{a}_2 = O_P(1)$ and $\hat{b}_2/n = o_P(1)$, we conclude that $\tilde{d}_{TV}(\bar{\mathbf{L}}^{(0)}, \bar{\mathbf{L}}^{(1)}) = o_{P^\star}(1)$. Hence,

$$d_{TV}^{\star}(\bar{\mathbf{L}}^{(0)}, \bar{\mathbf{L}}^{(1)}) = \mathbf{E}^{\star}\tilde{d}_{TV}(\bar{\mathbf{L}}^{(0)}, \bar{\mathbf{L}}^{(1)}) = \mathbf{E}^{\star}\min\big\{1, \tilde{d}_{TV}(\bar{\mathbf{L}}^{(0)}, \bar{\mathbf{L}}^{(1)})\big\} = o(1).$$

Let us prove (69). We proceed as in the proof of (53) for $h = 2$ above. Denote $b = \min\{\hat{b}_1, b_1\}$ and $\delta' = \hat{b}_1 - b$, $\delta'' = b_1 - b$. Given X, Y, let $\hat{\xi}_i$, $\hat{\Delta}'_i$, $\hat{\Delta}''_i$, $2 \le i \le m$, be independent Poisson random variables, which are independent of $\mathbb{I}_2, \dots, \mathbb{I}_m$, and having mean values

$$\tilde{\mathbf{E}}\hat{\xi}_i = \beta_n^{-1/2} X_i b, \qquad \tilde{\mathbf{E}}\hat{\Delta}'_i = \beta_n^{-1/2} X_i \delta', \qquad \tilde{\mathbf{E}}\hat{\Delta}''_i = \beta_n^{-1/2} X_i \delta''.$$

Denote

$$\hat{L}_k^{(1)} = \sum_{2 \le i \le m} \mathbb{I}_{ik}(\hat{\xi}_i + \hat{\Delta}'_i), \qquad \hat{L}_k^{(2)} = \sum_{2 \le i \le m} \mathbb{I}_{ik}(\hat{\xi}_i + \hat{\Delta}''_i), \quad k = 1, 2.$$

We note that $\hat{\mathbf{L}}^{(h)} := (\hat{L}_1^{(h)}, \hat{L}_2^{(h)})$ has the same distribution as $\bar{\mathbf{L}}^{(h)}$, $h = 1, 2$. Hence it suffices to show (69) for $\hat{\mathbf{L}}^{(1)}, \hat{\mathbf{L}}^{(2)}$. Proceeding as in the proof of (53) for $h = 2$ above, we reduce the problem to showing that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{E}}|\hat{L}_k^{(1)} - \hat{L}_k^{(2)}| = \sum_{2 \le i \le m} \lambda_{ik} \beta_n^{-1}(\delta' + \delta'') = Y_k \hat{a}_2 |\hat{b}_1 - b_1| = o(1), \qquad k = 1, 2.$$

Let us prove (70). We have, for $k = 1, 2$,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{E}}|L_k^{(2)} - L_k^{(3)}| = \sum_{2 \le i \le m} (1 - \mathbb{I}'_i)\big(\tilde{\mathbf{E}}\mathbb{I}_{ik}\big)\big(\tilde{\mathbf{E}}\bar{\xi}_{2i}\big) \le Y_k b_1 m^{-1} \sum_{2 \le i \le m} (1 - \mathbb{I}'_i) X_i^2.$$

Taking $\mathbf{E}^\star$ expected value we obtain

$$\mathbf{E}^\star|L_k^{(2)} - L_k^{(3)}| = \mathbf{E}^\star\big(\tilde{\mathbf{E}}|L_k^{(2)} - L_k^{(3)}|\big) \le Y_k b_1 \mathbf{E} X_2^2 \mathbb{I}_{\{X_2 \beta_n^{-1/2} b_1 \ge \varepsilon\}} = o(1).$$

We note that the expectation on right tends to zero since $\beta_n \to +\infty$.
Let us prove (71). We proceed as in the proof of (68) for $h = 0$ above. We have

$$\tilde{d}_{TV}(\mathbf{L}^{(3)}, \mathbf{L}^{(4)}) \le \sum_{2 \le i \le m} \mathbb{I}'_i \tilde{\mathbf{P}}\big(\mathbb{I}_{i1}, \mathbb{I}_{i2}) \ne (0,0)\big) \tilde{d}_{TV}(\bar{\xi}_{2i}, \tilde{\mathbb{I}}_i).$$

Next, we estimate $\mathbb{I}'_i \tilde{d}_{TV}(\bar{\xi}_{2i}, \tilde{\mathbb{I}}_i) \le \gamma_i^2$, by LeCam's inequality (50), and invoke the inequality $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}\big(\mathbb{I}_{i1}, \mathbb{I}_{i2}) \ne (0,0)\big) \le \lambda_{i1} + \lambda_{i2}$. We obtain

$$\tilde{d}_{TV}(\mathbf{L}^{(3)}, \mathbf{L}^{(4)}) \le \sum_{2 \le i \le m} \mathbb{I}'_i(\lambda_{i1} + \lambda_{i2})\gamma_i^2 \le \varepsilon \sum_{2 \le i \le m} \mathbb{I}'_i(\lambda_{i1} + \lambda_{i2})\gamma_i \le \varepsilon(Y_1 + Y_2) b_1 \hat{a}_2.$$

Here we used inequality $\gamma_i^2 \le \varepsilon \gamma_i$. It follows now that

$$d^\star_{TV}(\mathbf{L}^{(3)}, \mathbf{L}^{(4)}) \le \mathbf{E}^\star \tilde{d}_{TV}(\mathbf{L}^{(3)}, \mathbf{L}^{(4)}) \le \varepsilon(Y_1 + Y_2) b_1 a_2.$$

Let us prove (72). For $A \subset W$ denote $\tilde{S}(A) = \sum_{w_i \in A} \tilde{\mathbb{I}}_i$. For $k = 1, 2$ we write $\bar{L}_k^{(4)} = \tilde{S}(\mathbf{A}_k)$, where $\mathbf{A}_k$ denote the set attributes from $W \setminus \{w_1\}$ that are prescribed to v_k, i.e., $\mathbf{A}_k = \{w_i \in W \setminus \{w_1\} : w_i \to v_k\}$. Given $r_1, r_2 \ge 0$ introduce events $\mathcal{D}_k = \{\tilde{S}(\mathbf{A}_k) = r_k\}$, $k = 1, 2$, and $\mathcal{D} = \{|\mathbf{A}_1 \cap \mathbf{A}_2| \ge 1\}$.

We first show that

$$\mathbf{P}^\star(\bar{L}_1^{(4)}=r_1,\bar{L}_2^{(4)}=r_2)=\mathbf{E}^\star\big(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\bar{L}_1^{(4)}=r_1)\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\bar{L}_2^{(4)}=r_2)\big)+o(1). \tag{78}$$

It is convenient to write (78) in the form

$$\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{D}_1\cap\mathcal{D}_2)=\mathbf{E}^\star\big(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D}_1)\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D}_2)\big)+o(1).$$

Now, we observe that given X,Y, and $\mathbf{A}_1,\mathbf{A}_2$, satisfying $\mathbf{A}_1\cap\mathbf{A}_2=\emptyset$, the random variables $\tilde{S}(\mathbf{A}_1)$ and $\tilde{S}(\mathbf{A}_2)$ are independent. Hence for $\mathbf{A}_1\cap\mathbf{A}_2=\emptyset$ we have

$$\tilde{\mathbf{P}}\big(\mathcal{D}_1\cap\mathcal{D}_2|\mathbf{A}_1,\mathbf{A}_2\big)=\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D}_1|\mathbf{A}_1)\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D}_2|\mathbf{A}_2).$$

This identity implies

$$\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D}_1\cap\mathcal{D}_2\cap\bar{\mathcal{D}})=\tilde{\mathbf{E}}\big(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D}_1\cap\mathcal{D}_2|\mathbf{A}_1,\mathbf{A}_2)\bar{\mathbb{I}}_{\mathcal{D}}\big)=\tilde{\mathbf{E}}\big(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D}_1|\mathbf{A}_1)\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D}_2|\mathbf{A}_2)\bar{\mathbb{I}}_{\mathcal{D}}\big). \tag{79}$$

Next, combining inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}&0\le\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D}_1\cap\mathcal{D}_2)-\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D}_1\cap\mathcal{D}_2\cap\bar{\mathcal{D}})\le\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D}),\\&0\le\tilde{\mathbf{E}}\big(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D}_1|\mathbf{A}_1)\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D}_2|\mathbf{A}_2)\big)-\tilde{\mathbf{E}}\big(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D}_1|\mathbf{A}_1)\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D}_2|\mathbf{A}_2)\bar{\mathbb{I}}_{\mathcal{D}}\big)\le\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D})\end{aligned}$$

with (79) and using the identity (which holds, since given X,Y, the random sets $\mathbf{A}_1$ and $\mathbf{A}_2$ are independent)

$$\tilde{\mathbf{E}}\big(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D}_1|\mathbf{A}_1)\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D}_2|\mathbf{A}_2)\big)=\big(\tilde{\mathbf{E}}\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D}_1|\mathbf{A}_1)\big)\big(\tilde{\mathbf{E}}\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D}_2|\mathbf{A}_2)\big)=\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D}_1)\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D}_2)$$

we obtain that

$$\big|\mathbf{P}^\star(\mathcal{D}_1\cap\mathcal{D}_2)-\mathbf{E}^\star\big(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D}_1)\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D}_2)\big)\big|\le\mathbf{E}^\star\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D}).$$

It remains to show that $\mathbf{E}^\star\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D})=o(1)$. To this aim we apply Markov's inequality

$$\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D})\le\sum_{2\le i\le m}\tilde{\mathbf{E}}\mathbb{I}_{i1}\mathbb{I}_{i2}\le\sum_{2\le i\le m}\mathbf{E}\lambda_{i1}\lambda_{i2}=n^{-1}Y_1Y_2\hat{a}_2 \tag{80}$$

and obtain $\mathbf{E}^\star(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\mathcal{D}))\le n^{-1}Y_1Y_2a_2=o(1)$ thus completing the proof of (78).
We secondly show that

$$\mathbf{E}^\star\big|\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\bar{L}_1^{(4)}=r_1)\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\bar{L}_2^{(4)}=r_2)-\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\bar{L}_1^{(5)}=r_1)\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\bar{L}_2^{(5)}=r_2)\big|\le\varepsilon(Y_1+Y_2)b_1a_2. \tag{81}$$

Denote, for short, the expression $|\cdots|=|q_1q_2-h_1h_2|$ in (81). Since $0\le q_1,q_2,h_1,h_2\le1$, we have $|q_1q_2-h_1h_2|\le|q_1-h_1|+|q_2-h_2|$. We apply LeCam's inequality (50) and obtain

$$|q_k-h_k|\le\sum_{2\le i\le m}\mathbb{I}'_i\lambda_{ik}\gamma_i^2\le\varepsilon\sum_{2\le i\le m}\mathbb{I}'_i\lambda_{ik}\gamma_i\le\varepsilon Y_1b_1\hat{a}_2,\qquad k=1,2.$$

Here we estimate $\gamma_i^2\le\varepsilon\gamma_i$. Clearly, inequality $\mathbf{E}^\star|q_k-h_k|\le\varepsilon Y_kb_1a_2$ imply (81).
Finally, we show that

$$\mathbf{E}^\star\big(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\bar{L}_1^{(5)}=r_1)\tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\bar{L}_2^{(5)}=r_2)\big)\to\mathbf{P}^\star(\Lambda_3=r_1)\mathbf{P}^\star(\Lambda_4=r_2). \tag{82}$$

Here we will use the fact that the almost sure convergence $\hat{a}_2 \to a_2$ implies the convergence in probability

$$(\theta_1, \theta_2) \xrightarrow{P} (\lambda_3, \lambda_4). \tag{83}$$

Since for $s, t \geq 0$ the function $(s,t) \to e^{-t-s} s^{r_1} t^{r_2}/(r_1! r_2!)$ is continuous and bounded, (83) implies the convergence of expected values

$$\mathbf{E}^\star \frac{e^{-\theta_1} e^{-\theta_2} \theta_1^{r_1} \theta_2^{r_2}}{r_1! r_2!} \to \mathbf{E}^\star \frac{e^{-\lambda_3} e^{-\lambda_4} \lambda_3^{r_1} \lambda_4^{r_2}}{r_1! r_2!} = \frac{e^{-\lambda_3} e^{-\lambda_4} \lambda_3^{r_1} \lambda_4^{r_2}}{r_1! r_2!}. \tag{84}$$

We observe that the quantities on the left (right) sides of (82) and (84) are the same. Hence (84) implies (82).
It remains to prove (83). Denote $\hat{\lambda}_{k+2} = Y_k b_1 \hat{a}_2$, $k = 1, 2$. We have for any $\delta > 0$

$$\mathbf{P}^\star(|\theta_k - \hat{\lambda}_{2+k}| \geq \delta) \leq \delta^{-1} \mathbf{E}^\star |\theta_k - \hat{\lambda}_{2+k}| \leq \delta^{-1} Y_k b_1 \mathbf{E} X_2^2 (1 - \mathbb{I}'_2) = o(1). \tag{85}$$

In the last step we used $\mathbf{E} X_2^2 (1 - \mathbb{I}'_2) = o(1)$. Now, (83) follows from (85) and the bounds $\hat{\lambda}_{k+2} - \lambda_{k+2} = o_P(1)$, $k = 1, 2$, which are simple consequences of the fact that $\mathbf{E} X_1^2 < \infty$ implies $\hat{a}_2 - a_2 = o_P(1)$. □

4 Appendix B

Lemma 4. *Let $c, \varkappa, h > 0$. Let Z, Λ_Z be non-negative random variables such that $\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_Z = r) = \mathbf{E}\big(e^{-Z} Z^r / r!\big)$, $r = 0, 1, \ldots$.*
(i) The relation $\mathbf{P}(Z > t) = (c + o(1)) t^{-\varkappa}$ as $t \to +\infty$ implies

$$\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_Z > t) = (c + o(1)) t^{-\varkappa} \qquad as \quad t \to +\infty. \tag{86}$$

(ii) If the distribution of Z has property $\mathcal{A}_{c,\varkappa}$ then $\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_Z = r) \approx c r^{-\varkappa}$.
(iii) If hZ is integer valued and satisfies $\mathbf{P}(hZ = r) \approx c(h/r)^\varkappa$ then $\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_Z = r) \approx chr^{-\varkappa}$.

Proof of Lemma 4. Let us prove (i). We first collect auxiliary inequalities. For a Poisson random variable Λ with mean $z > 0$ and $0 < s < z < t$ we have, see [17],

$$\mathbf{P}(\Lambda \geq t) \leq e^{-z} (ez/t)^t, \qquad \mathbf{P}(\Lambda \leq s) \leq e^{-z} (ez/s)^s. \tag{87}$$

For $0 < x < 1$ and $y > 1$ we have

$$\ln(1 - x) \leq -x - 0.5x^2, \qquad \ln(1 + x) \leq x - 0.25x^2, \qquad \ln(1 + y) \leq y \ln 2. \tag{88}$$

In order to prove (86) we split the probability $\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_Z > t) = P_1 + P_2 + P_3$, where

$$P_1 = \mathbf{P}(\Lambda_Z > t, Z < t_1), \quad P_2 = \mathbf{P}(\Lambda_Z > t, Z \in [t_1, t_2]), \quad P_3 = \mathbf{P}(\Lambda_Z > t, Z > t_2),$$
$$t_1 = t(1 - \varepsilon), \qquad t_2 = t(1 + \varepsilon), \qquad \varepsilon = t^{-1/3},$$

and show that $P_2 = (c + o(1)) t^{-\varkappa}$ and $P_k = o(t^{-\varkappa})$, $k = 1, 2$.
We have

$$P_2 \leq \mathbf{P}(t_1 \leq Z \leq t_2) = (c + o(1))(t_1^{-\varkappa} - t_2^{-\varkappa}) = o(t^{-\varkappa}).$$

Next, we estimate P_1. Given $z < t_1$ we denote $\bar z = 1 - z/t$. Using (87), (88) we obtain

$$\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_Z > t | Z = z) \le e^{-z}(ez/t)^t = e^{t-z+t\ln(1-\bar z)} \le e^{t-z-t\bar z-0.5t\bar z^2} = e^{-0.5t\bar z^2} \le e^{-0.5t\varepsilon^2}.$$

Hence, $P_1 = \mathbf{E}\big(\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_Z > t|Z)\mathbb{I}_{\{Z<t_1\}}\big) \le e^{-0.5\varepsilon^2 t} = o(t^{-\varkappa})$. In order to evaluate P_3 we observe that $\mathbf{P}(Z > t_2) = (c + o(1))t^{-\varkappa}$ and write

$$P_3 = \mathbf{P}(Z > t_2) - \mathbf{P}(\Lambda_Z \le t, Z > t_2).$$

Then we estimate

$$\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_Z \le t, Z > t_2) = \mathbf{E}\big(\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_Z \le t|Z)\mathbb{I}_{\{Z>t\}}\big) = o(t^{-\varkappa})$$

using the inequality

$$\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_Z \le t | Z = z) \le \max\big\{e^{-0.25\varepsilon^2 t}, e^{-t\ln(e/2)}\big\}, \qquad \forall\ z > t_2. \tag{89}$$

It remains to prove (89). We have, see (87),

$$\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_Z \le t | Z = z) \le e^{-z}(ez/t)^t = e^{t-z+t\ln(1+y)}.$$

Here $y = zt^{-1} - 1$. For $0 < y < 1$ the quantity on the right is less than $e^{-0.25\varepsilon^2 t}$, by the second inequality of (88). For $y \ge 1$, by the third inequality of (88), the quantity on the right is less than $e^{-(z-t)(1-\ln 2)} \le e^{-t\ln(e/2)}$, since $z - t = ty \ge t$.

Let us prove (ii). We only consider the case of integer valued Z. For an absolute continuous Z proof is the same. Denote $\varepsilon_r = r^{-1/2}\ln r$. We split

$$\mathbf{P}(\Lambda_Z = r) = \mathbf{E}\big(e^{-Z}Z^r/r!\big) = J_1 + J_2 + J_3, \qquad J_k = \mathbf{E}\big(\mathbb{I}_{\{Z\in Q_k\}}e^{-Z}Z^r/r!\big),$$
$$Q_1 = [0, r(1-\varepsilon_r)), \qquad Q_2 = [r(1-\varepsilon_r), r(1+\varepsilon_r)], \qquad Q_3 = (r(1+\varepsilon_r), +\infty),$$

and show that

$$J_1 = o(r^{-\varkappa}), \qquad J_3 = o(r^{-\varkappa}), \qquad J_2 = (c + o(1))r^{-\varkappa} \qquad \text{as} \quad r \to +\infty. \tag{90}$$

In the proof we use the following bounds related to the integral representation of Euler's Gamma function. Given interval $Q \subset [0, +\infty)$, denote

$$I_Q = \int_Q \frac{e^{-x}x^r}{r!}dx, \qquad S_Q = \sum_{j\in Q_k} \frac{e^{-j}j^r}{r!}.$$

For large r we have

$$I_{Q_1} \le r^{-0.3\ln r}, \qquad I_{Q_3} \le r^{-0.3\ln r}, \qquad 1 - 2r^{-0.3\ln r} \le I_{Q_2} \le 1. \tag{91}$$

Relations (90) follow from (91) and the approximation $S_{Q_k} = (1 + o(1))I_{Q_k}$, $k = 1, 2, 3$,

$$J_k = \sum_{j\in Q_k} \frac{e^{-j}j^r}{r!}\mathbf{P}(Z = r) \le S_{Q_k} = (1 + o(1))I_{Q_k}, \qquad k = 1, 3,$$
$$J_2 = \sum_{j\in Q_2} \frac{e^{-j}j^r}{r!}\mathbf{P}(Z = r) = \frac{c + o(1)}{r^{\varkappa}}S_{Q_2} = \frac{c + o(1)}{r^{\varkappa}}(1 + o(1))I_{Q_2}.$$

For reader's convenience we provide a proof of (91). We note that the third relation of (91) follows from the first two and the well known fact that $I_{[0,+\infty)} = 1$. In the proof, for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, we apply the inequalities, which follow by Taylor's expansion,

$$e^{\varepsilon}(1-\varepsilon) \le 1 - \varepsilon^2/3, \qquad e^{-\varepsilon}(1+\varepsilon) \le 1 - \varepsilon^2/3.$$

Since the function $x \to e^{-x}x^r$ increases on Q_1, we have $I_{Q_1} \le ze^{-z}z^r/r!$, where $z = r(1-\varepsilon_r)$ is the right end-point of Q_1. Using Stirling's formula we obtain for large r

$$ze^{-z}z^r/r! = (1+o(1))e^{r\varepsilon_r}(1-\varepsilon_r)^{r+1}(r/2\pi)^{1/2} \le r^{1/2}(1-\varepsilon_r^2/3)^r \le r^{-0.3\ln r}.$$

In the last step we used $1-\varepsilon \le e^{-\varepsilon}$. Furthermore, for $y = r(1+\varepsilon_r)$ we have decreases on Q_3 we have

$$I_{Q_3} \le \frac{e^{-y}y^r}{r!}\int_y^{+\infty} e^{-(x-y)}\Big(1+\frac{x-y}{y}\Big)^r dx. \tag{92}$$

Using Stirling's formula we obtain

$$e^{-y}y^r/r! = (1+o(1))\big(e^{-\varepsilon_r}(1+\varepsilon_r)\big)^r(2\pi r)^{-1/2} \le r^{-1/2}(1-\varepsilon_r^2/3)^r \le r^{-0.5-0.3\ln r}.$$

Combining this inequality with the following upper bound on the integral of (92)

$$\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-t}(1+t/y)^r dt \le \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-t}e^{(rt/y)}dt = 1+\varepsilon_r^{-1} \le r^{1/2}$$

we obtain (91). Here we used the inequality $(1+t/y)^r \le e^{(rt/y)}$.
We omit the proof of (iii) since it is similar to that of (ii). □

Acknowledgement. The present study was motivated by a question of Konstantin Avratchenkov about the degree-degree distribution in a random intersection graph. A discussion with Konstantin Avratchenkov and Jerzy Jaworski about the influence of the clustering property on the degree-degree distribution was the starting point of this research.

References

[1] A. Aleškevičienė, R. Leipus and J. Šiaulys. Tail behavior of random sums under consistent variation with applications to the compound renewal risk model. *Extremes*, 11:261-279, 2008.

[2] K. Avratchenkov, N. M. Markovich, J.K. Sreedharan. Distribution and dependence of extremes in network sampling processes. *Research report n^o 8578, INRIA Sophia Antipolis*. 2014.

[3] A. D. Barbour and G. Reinert. The shortest distance in random multi-type intersection graphs. *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 39:179–209, 2011.

[4] M. Bloznelis, J. Damarackas. Degree distribution of an inhomogeneous random intersection graph. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 20(3), #P3, 2013.

[5] M. Bloznelis, E. Godehardt, J. Jaworski, V. Kurauskas, and K. Rybarczyk. Recent Progress in Complex Network Analysis - Properties of Random Intersection Graphs. In *B. Lausen, S. Krolak-Schwerdt, M. Bhmer, Eds.*, Data Science, Learning by Latent Structures, and Knowledge Discovery. Springer, 2015.

[6] M. Bloznelis, J. Jaworski, and V. Kurauskas. Assortativity and clustering coefficient of sparse random intersection graphs. *Electronic journal of probability*, 18, N-38, 2013.

[7] M. Bloznelis, V. Kurauskas. Clustering function: a measure of social influence. `arXiv:1207.4941`, 2012.

[8] M. Boguna, R. Pastor-Satorras, and A. Vespignani. Epidemic spreading in complex networks with degree correlations. *Statistical Mechanics of Complex Networks. Lecture Notes in Physics*, 625:127–147, 2003.

[9] M. Bradonjic, A. Hagberg, N. W. Hengartner, and A. G. Percus. Component Evolution in General Random Intersection Graphs. In *The 7th Workshop on Algorithms and Models for the Web Graph, WAW2010*, *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, 6516:36–49. 2010.

[10] M. Deijfen and W. Kets. Random intersection graphs with tunable degree distribution and clustering. *Probab. Engrg. Inform. Sci.*, 23:661–674, 2009.

[11] S. Foss, D. Korshunov, and S. Zachary. *An Introduction to Heavy-Tailed and Subexponential Distributions. 2nd Edition* Springer, New York, 2013.

[12] E. Godehardt and J. Jaworski. Two models of random intersection graphs and their applications. *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics*, 10:129–132, 2001.

[13] E. A. Grechnikov. The degree distribution and the number of edges between vertices of given degrees in the Buckley-Osthus model of a random web graph. *Internet Mathematics*, 8:257-287, 2012.

[14] R. van der Hofstad, N. Litvak. Degree-degree dependencies in random graphs with heavy-tailed degrees. *Internet Mathematics*,10: 287-334, 2014.

[15] S. Janson, T. Łuczak and A. Ruciński. *Random Graphs.* Wiley, New York, 2001.

[16] M. Karoński, E. R. Scheinerman, and K. B. Singer-Cohen. On random intersection graphs: The subgraph problem. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 8:131–159, 1999.

[17] M. Mitzenmacher, E. Upfal. *Probability and Computing. Randomized Algorithms and Probabilistic Analysis.* Cambridge University Press. 2005.

[18] L. Muchnik, S. Pei, L. C. Parra, S. D. S. Reis, J. S. Jr Andrade, S. Havlin, and H. A. Makse. Origins of power-law degree distribution in the heterogeneity of human activity in social networks. *Scientific Reports*, 3: 1783, 2013.

[19] M.E.J. Newman. Assortative mixing in networks. *Physical review letters*, 89(20):208701, 2002.

[20] M. E.J. Newman. Mixing patterns in networks. *Physical Review E*, 67(2):026126, 2003.

[21] S. Nikoletseas, C. Raptopoulos, and P. G. Spirakis. The existence and efficient construction of large independent sets in general random intersection graphs. In *ICALP (2004), J. Daz, J. Karhumki, A. Lepist, and D. Sannella, Eds.*, volume 3142 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 1029–1040. Springer, 2004.

[22] J. M. Steele. Le Cam's inequality and Poisson approximations. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 101:48–54, 1994.